

Bill which was introduced and supported by one who stood so near the Prime Minister, year by year, by which the Grand Trunk was paralysed and the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway were promoted, and I cannot bring myself to believe that the hon. gentleman would have taken the position he has in support of the amendment of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) if he thought the Government had any serious objection to the amendment. The hon. gentleman not only failed to give us any information with regard to his own motives of action, but he failed to make any allusion to the speech of an hon. gentleman who supported the amendment—the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Now, that hon. gentleman has been in this House a very ardent supporter of the Administration. How is it that the hon. gentleman on this question arrays himself, along with the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in opposition to the course that the Government has seen proper to pursue upon this Bill? Sir, rumor has gone abroad that the hon. gentleman is not without aspirations for a seat upon the Treasury benches; rumor has gone abroad that a round robin has been sent along the back benches, on that side of the House, in the hon. gentleman's interests, asking the Government to find a place for him upon the Treasury benches. It is said that the scarlet robe of the Minister of Customs has become somewhat faded by his long sitting upon the Treasury benches, and that he is no longer a fitting representative of a very large section of the Protestant population of the Province of Ontario; and so it is proposed—at all events, such is the rumor—to recuperate that section of the Government by adding the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Well, Sir, the hon. member for West York is opposing the Administration of which so many of his friends desire that he should become a member. The hon. member shakes his head. I have no doubt that he is sincere in that shake. I do not think the hon. gentleman feels that he is opposing the Administration; I do not think he feels that by giving the vote he intends to give in support of the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka, he is doing any detriment to the Government of which he wishes to become an important member. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, feels that, as it is said all roads lead to Rome, so all lines of action upon this motion, on that side of the House, will lead towards the Treasury benches, because they are alike intended to protect and strengthen the right hon. gentleman and those associated with him in the Government of this country. I think the hon. member for West York is quite right, and perhaps quite consistent, in his support of the Administration by supporting the motion of the hon. member for Muskoka rather than the motion of the Minister of Finance. We have had the two sides of the Government presented on this question. The hon. member for North Simcoe talked of the two sides of the shield, and I never saw an instance in which there were two sides to a political shield more manifest, and, I may say, more admirably presented, than they have been on this occasion. Although we may admire the hon. Minister of Justice for the very able speech he made on one side, and the hon. member for North Simcoe, for the very ardent speech he made on the other, I think we must after all give credit to the skill and generalship of the Von Moltke who leads the Government, and who leads this House. This, Mr. Speaker, is a sort of introduction to the new plan of campaign—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The preamble is not part of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS—which the Government have presented. The introduction is not without interest. Of course when, in a novel play, the actor is introduced to an audience, it

is always interesting to those who understand it, and who are looking on, and who are anxious to see how it will end. Sir, the Minister of Justice last night made a very exhaustive speech in defence of the action of the Government, a speech in almost every word of which I cordially concur. When the hon. gentleman had completed that speech the hon. Premier was ready for a division. He did not see any necessity for any further discussion upon the subject. It had been fully and exhaustively discussed. Both sides of the Government shield had been presented to the House. The Government had made their defence before the country, and they say to the electors, You can follow the Minister of Justice and support the Government, or you can take the other side, and follow the hon. member for North Simcoe, and support the Government; and so, whichever way the matter may be arranged, it comes to supporting the Government after all. It is like the trade between the hunter and the Indian. It is: you take the owl and I will take the turkey; or, I will take the turkey and you take the owl. It goes to the Government, no matter what the choice may be. Well, Sir, the Prime Minister was no doubt ready for a division, but we were not, and is it to be wondered at? I expect, at all events, and no doubt the vast majority on this side of the House expect, to support the Government. But when one is in questionable company he always feels obliged to make some defence or explanation of his conduct; and I feel it necessary, in view of the political character of the gentlemen with whom I am to be associated in this vote, to give some account and some justification to the public for the course I intend to pursue. Now, we, on this side of the House, feel that this is a very important question. It is one which is calculated to arouse religious feeling, and religious prejudice; it is one in respect of which men, if they once become permeated with it, are likely to throw reason to the winds; and, therefore, in this incipient stage—if the incipient stage of the excitement and controversy is not passed—it is important that the Opposition, as well as the members and supporters of the Government, should have an opportunity of assigning to the public what is a sufficient reason for their own justification, and which I think will be regarded as a sufficient reason by the great mass of those who support them, for the course which they intend to adopt on this occasion. We have had most of the speaking so far done on one side. Our business in this discussion, Mr. Speaker, is to stand up for the right, to allay, so far as we can, the popular excitement, to correct the popular misapprehension as to the nature of the question put in issue by this Bill—not to become mere weathercocks which will indicate the strength of the gale which may be blowing from this or that particular direction. I have, and I have no doubt that every gentleman on this side of the House has, too much respect for the good sense and the good intentions of the people to undertake to convert this Jesuits' Estates Bill into a sort of "Gin's Baby" for the purpose of creating religious excitement and for arousing religious animosities throughout the country. So, for these reasons, we propose fully to discuss this question, and I think the time occupied in such a discussion is not wasted. There is one advantage, amongst the many disadvantages of popular excitement, that under it people are more likely to listen, with attention to what is said, and you have an opportunity of imparting to them information upon a subject which they would not be likely to receive under other circumstances. That being the case, I think we are justified, notwithstanding our anxiety to bring this Session to a close, in taking whatever time may be necessary, to enter fully into the discussion of this subject, and to give to the people who sent us here all the information necessary to enable them to form an intelligent conclusion on the merits of the question in issue. Sir, this is a most important question. The motion that has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) is, in