

not scrupled in that Province to attack our Protestant institutions and to dictate as to the education of our Protestant children. Only a few years ago we were startled to learn that a work which is one of the best known, one of the most generally admired, and one of the most beautiful compositions in the English language, a work, too, by an author who is preeminent for the purity and morality of his writings—had been, as we believe at least, at their instance, struck from the curriculum of our high schools. Only so recently as the year 1886 we find that the same influence was at work in our common public schools and that an attempt was being made and successfully made to banish from those schools that which is the very sign and symbol of the Protestant faith, the Protestant bible; and to substitute for the book itself a collection of attenuated and mutilated extracts from it. We find, in fact, that an astute and subtle attack was being made against the very character of that book and that an attempt was being made to poison the minds of our children against it, and to represent it as a book unfitted to be placed in their hands. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my Roman Catholic friends in this House and in this country, to place themselves in our position and to ask themselves whether they would not have resented such an attempt to interfere with the educational system in the Province of Quebec, and whether they would not have resented such an insidious attack upon their own religion? I would ask them to put themselves in the place of the Protestants of Ontario, and to tell me if they would not have viewed with alarm any action on the part of the state which was calculated to strengthen the hands of a society which they believed had been in this way interfering with the education of their children and endeavoring to subvert their religious faith. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer. I will only say that I intend to record my vote in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), and I will do so not so much as an expression of censure upon the conduct of the Government whose general policy I support with so much pleasure, and whose conduct in reference to this particular matter has been circumscribed by conditions of such deep importance to the Dominion; but rather because I disapprove altogether of the kind of legislation which we have had under our consideration. I believe it to be improper and dangerous legislation. I believe, in the first place—and as this debate has proceeded my opinion in that regard has been strengthened—that there has been a deliberate setting aside, with pomp and parade, of the principle that His Holiness the Pope of Rome should not interfere in our affairs of state. I think this is dangerous legislation for another reason. I think that in these days of party Government no more dangerous precedent could very well be laid down than that a political party should be enabled—it may be for purely party reasons—to endow a religious body with large sums of public money. It seems to me that if we admit such a principle as that, we open a door which it will be difficult to close; and it seems to me that the dangers against which the Act of Mortmain was levelled were insignificant as compared with the dangers which may be incurred if we admit such a principle as that—the principle that a political party shall be permitted at any moment that it pleases to endeavor to secure the assistance of a religious body by conferring upon it large sums of public money. I say that is a dangerous principle, and that is a principle which is involved in the legislation we are discussing. I shall support this resolution also as a solemn protest by a humble member of this House against consolidating the power in this Dominion of a society which, however able and however devoted its members may be, is yet a society which throughout all Christendom has proved to be unscrupulous and aggressive, a fomentor of discord, and a stirrer up of strife, and which I am afraid, from what we have

Mr. McNEILL.

already experienced in the Province of Ontario, is prepared to pursue here in Canada those self-same tactics which rendered necessary its suppression in almost every European state.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to move the adjournment of the debate. There are many gentlemen on this side yet to speak on the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope hon. gentlemen will not have any objection to this motion. We adjourned rather early yesterday, and I think we can agree that the debate will be ended to-morrow.

Mr. MULOCK. We cannot promise.

Mr. LAURIER. We cannot promise, but I think we can do our best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knew that the hon. member for North Simcoe was going to speak a couple of hours, which would run the debate very late, and there would have been no opportunity of a reply by the Minister at two o'clock in the morning. That was the reason of adjourning yesterday. Surely we can go on to-night.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend will speak at some length also, and it cannot be hoped that we shall reach a conclusion this evening.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the hon. First Minister will be consulting the wishes of a great many members if he will yield to the request of the hon. member for Bothwell. I doubt if persistence in the debate at this hour of the night will accomplish what he appears to desire to accomplish, a speedy termination of the debate. We are engaged now, irrespective of all party consideration, in dealing with a question of vast importance. Parliament has been spoken to by the country on the subject, and it is the duty of Parliament to give, and the country demands from Parliament, a full expression of opinion upon it; and at a quarter to twelve to-night, half an hour later than the hour last night, at which the First Minister said it was time to adjourn, is surely late enough. I, therefore, hope he will allow the debate to be adjourned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think as a matter of fair play the request made by my hon. friend from Bothwell ought to be granted. We raised no objection to the request of the hon. Minister last night that the House should adjourn at an unusually early hour, in order to accommodate the hon. member for North Simcoe, and the same courtesy should be extended to a gentleman occupying the position in the House of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think under the circumstances, and under the pressure of the hon. gentleman who has moved the adjournment and of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, if it is understood that we will sit it out to-morrow night—

Mr. LAURIER. We will sit as late as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is understood we close to-morrow night.

Mr. MULOCK. We must not gag the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then we must go on, or make an arrangement of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is quite certain that we have no desire to protract the discussion. We will do everything possible on our side to meet his views, which are to close to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will feel that we intend no dis-