[COMMONS]

in the nationality of this country. I be-to the work of the Conservative party in lieved in it long ago, and I have done what Canada, bitterly opposed, opposed tooth and little I could with the younger men of nail by the gentleman who, last year, claim-Canada in boasting of that nationality and ed all the credit for Canada being a nation. encouraging its growth whenever the opportunity arose I was so educated in the debate. party to which I belong. But how was There are inde-Canada made a nation ? pendent judges. I propose to quote one. a gentleman whose name has been spoken with great respect. a gentleman who had the pleasure of meeting the right hon. leader of this Government and ascertaining from him all that he could say on behalf of Canada and on behalf of the party to which he belonged. The gentleman I proposed to quote, evidently had studied to which he belonged. carefully the politics and the history of this country. No doubt he had read in the Laurier) move London "Standard," for instance, the ob-servations of the right hon. gentleman's Motion agree colleague, the Finance Minister, in inform-at 11.45 p.m. ing the English public as late as 1886 that the whole tendency of the Canadian system is to squander money in the far west. No doubt he knew of another ally of the right hon. gentlemán, the present Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who. speaking in the presence of the Finance Minister when they went to electrify and educate the electors of the county of Annapolis, said that it was war against God and nature and against every element of geography o'clock. to attempt establish to any consolidated nationality under our present union. He knew that the right hon. gentleman's allies had endeavoured as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has explained to tear to pieces the Canadian confederation. He knew that Mr. Blake in 1871, had denounced the Canadian Pacific Railway undertaking as fatal to the existence of the union, that Mr. Blake in 1880 had moved to postpone its construction, and in 1881 had denounced the contract as fatal to the future of Canada. And knowing all this, and seeing what had been done in spite of these objections on the part of powerful men of Canada, realizing the pesition that Canada had obtained under a Liberal Conservative Government that had been able to carry out these great schemes, he settled the questions as to who had made Canada a nation. This gentleman, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, speaking in the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce on January 18th, 1898, said :

an a construction of the first state and an and the second state and the state state state and the state and

Why, it is not so long ago since the greater part of the Dominion of Canada was considered to be nothing more than a wilderness of snow. in which with difficulty a few wild animals were trapped for the sake of their skins. (Hear, hear, and a voice, "What about the Klondike ?") And its prosperity is only due to the fact that within a few years that magnificent enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, opened up this vast country, opened the greatest wheat fields in the world, and is going to open up probably the greatest gold fields in the world. (Hear, hear.) That is the tribute paid by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister, Sunday newspapers, which provision re-Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

## REPORTS.

The Civil Service List .-- (Mr. Fitzpatrick.) Tables of Trade and Navigation.-(Mr. Paterson.)

Report of the Department of Inland Revenue.--(Sir Henry Joly de Lotbiniere.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 8th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three

PRAYERS.

## BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) to promote the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have been asked to explain the Bill, and I desire at this stage to offer a few words of explanation. The introduction of this Bill. I presume, is becoming a transaction which savours somewhat of monotony in this House. If I consulted my own wishes and my own interests as a politician, I certainly should not introduce this Bill. I am conscious that it has stood in my way in a political sense, and has made me unpopular to some extent among my fellow-members in this House. I have felt, however, as a matter of duty, that the introduction of this Bill was a step in the public interest; and, being of that opinion. I have introduced it session after session, and not for any purpose of acquiring popularity; for I am not so stupid as to suppose that I am acquiring popularity in taking the step that I take to-day. The Bill introduced to-day differs from the Bill of last session. It embodies but one provision. that prohibiting the publication of

-----