

as drawn—and that has been admitted by the Prime Minister and the members of his government—if that had been so, why should not that connection have been made within twenty-four hours? Why did it take a whole month of bickerings, of wranglings, of strife, which necessitated the resignation of one minister; the most important minister in connection with this Bill. It took a whole month of tribulation in the ranks of the government before any change was made. The Prime Minister said that he did not understand that clause to mean what it did mean, the Minister of Justice said that he did not understand that clause to mean what it did mean.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I did not.

Mr. OSLER. Did not the Minister of Justice say that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I did not.

Mr. OSLER. I beg the minister's pardon; he said he did not understand it to mean what it did—what it was supposed to mean.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let him go on.

Mr. OSLER. It took a month to have that clause changed. It was not in the Prime Minister's power, apparently, to change it to suit his own views within that time. There was a power outside the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice who had to be consulted before the concession was made that that clause should be changed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Rubbish.

Mr. OSLER. It is the view the country takes of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That's rubbish.

Mr. OSLER. It is the only view sensible men can take of it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is the view evil-disposed persons take of it.

Mr. OSLER. The colleague of the Postmaster General took the view I take, namely, that the meaning of the clause at first introduced, was so radically different from the clause now before us, that he resigned rather than accept it as first introduced, while he accepted it as now changed. The Prime Minister says that originally he intended the clause as it is in the Bill to-day. Was it not easy then, if he had the power to alter that clause to its present state, to do so without requiring the resignation of the Minister of the Interior?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is not the point.

Mr. OSLER. That is the point.

Mr. OSLER.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has shifted his ground.

Mr. OSLER. I have not shifted my ground.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the government were not allowed to make this change without the consent of some outside power.

Mr. OSLER. I say so still.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Then the hon. gentleman says what is absolutely without foundation. He has no authority for such a statement, and it is a malicious fabrication.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; take it back.

Mr. OSLER. Oh, no; let the Postmaster General's statement go on 'Hansard'; I know him.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Your statement is absolutely untrue.

Mr. OSLER. I know the Postmaster General, I know him. Then, if I am to accept the Postmaster General's statement, I say that the First Minister and the other ministers in needlessly delaying a month to make that change, committed a crime against this country that it will take generations to wipe out, for they have during that month aroused such a passion in this country—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has.

Mr. OSLER. No, I deny it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He and his party have.

Mr. OSLER. I deny it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You tried to.

Mr. OSLER. I say that all that has tended to arouse passion in this country has come from that side of the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Nonsense.

Mr. BUREAU. What about the Hamilton 'Spectator' article.

Mr. OSLER. Like the other article read to-day from a French paper, there are injudicious articles on both sides, and no one appreciates that more than I do. There is no one more sorry than I am that this condition of affairs has arisen—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It seems to gratify you.

Mr. OSLER. I say that the country will hold the Prime Minister and the ministers responsible until they deny, and they have not denied it yet, that they are under the influence and have been influenced by outside parties in the framing of this Act. Canada can stand bad government, she can stand bad laws—