

it sounded very much like the other ; but the action of the majority showed how a spirit of patriotism actually induced the House to stultify itself by voting down the motion.

Mr. HOLTON : My right hon. friend ought not to charge the House with stultifying itself in any act the House may take. This is out of order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, if the House had not stultified itself, it had passed a resolution which stultified itself. This was quite in order.

Mr. HOLTON : No proceeding of the House must thus be characterized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would take back what he had stated ; and would discuss the matter in the freer atmosphere outside of the House. In this instance, they had the House passing a Bill unanimously, and, when the other House ventured to amend it, and they were asked to disagree with the amendment, a majority of the House had declared that the amendment was quite right, and that they would not disagree with it ; and, after doing so, a motion was made to consider the Bill this day three months. To what extent and to what length would not the spirit of party carry men.

Mr. TUPPER said he wished to make a few remarks with relation to the very extraordinary position in which the question before the House then stood. The case had been stated strongly by his right hon. friend, but not strongly enough. It was not the case of an ordinary Bill introduced by an hon. member, and which, without undergoing careful consideration in the place on which the House relied for the treatment of such questions, had come before the House for consideration ; but a case in which strong exception had been taken to the Bill by leading members of the Railway Committee, to whom it had been sent. The hon. member for Sunbury had just told the House that he brought before the Railway Committee the strong objection he had to the measure receiving its approval. The Minister of Justice also took exception to the Bill, and it was very well known that the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Blake) and one of his colleagues on the Treasury benches differed very strongly in opinion upon this measure.

Mr. HOLTON : Will my hon. friend permit me ? My right hon. friend from Kingston called an hon. member to order for discussing the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER said he was not going to discuss the Bill, but the conduct of the hon. gentlemen who had dealt with it. He did not wonder at his hon. friend trying to prevent his taking this line of argument by raising a point of order ; but before he sat down he would place that hon. gentleman in a very equivocal position before the House with relation to this Bill. The Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Chateauguay, and other hon. gentlemen had taken exception to the mode in which the Bill was presented, and they had undertaken to remodel it. The Committee did so ; and, after the most careful and exhaustive examination, they made—notwithstanding the objections of the hon. member for Sunbury—such changes and alterations in it that he believed that he was correct in saying that it passed the Committee without dissent. At all events, the Bill was so changed as to induce the hon. member for Chateauguay—as the hon. gentleman had just stated—to move that the Bill should at once receive the sanction of the House.

Mr. HOLTON : All the Bills.

Mr. TUPPER said he did not care how many there were of them. The hon. member stood before the House as the father of this identical Bill. It was then, in fact, a new Bill, prepared by the Committee to meet every objection after every objection had been taken to it ; and the hon. member for Chateauguay, than whom no member of the House gave more careful consideration—this he was bound to say in compliment and in just compliment to the hon. gentleman—to measures before Committees, or discharged his duties on leading Committees of the House with greater fidelity, insisted that no measure should pass the Railway Committee or any of the most important Standing Committees until it was made to square with the public interests ; and the