

Edward Island, and they had a meeting of all classes and of all grades of politics, both Opposition and Government; there was no difference at all known there; they were all pleased and happy to meet him, and any leader of the Government or of the Opposition would have been treated precisely in the same way. So far as public works on Prince Edward Island were concerned, they had been very well attended to. The hon. member for Queen's County had told this House that, if there was an opening in Prince Edward Island, six members would be returned to support the Opposition. That was something he could not say anything about. The hon. member perhaps was speaking rather too largely himself. But this he would say, that the hon. member ran last year by a pure accident, and unfortunately got in, with not a very big vote. There was a very small vote polled. The Government party had been assured of success, and a great number never attended the election at all. The other party started out and gave the hon. member a vote; but he could tell that hon. gentleman that, when he went back to Queen's County, he would have the hardest time to get in. If he (Mr. Yeo) were spared until that time, he intended to run himself, and if the hon. member liked to go there again, he would have as hot a time as he ever had. He had always found this Government liberal, and ready to carry out terms in good faith, and therefore he gave them his support.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved the adjournment of the Debate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I certainly calculated last night on getting through with the debate to-day. It has taken a new turn to-day, for some members have taken occasion to air grievances which are generally left until the time when the Estimates are before the House, in moving into Supply, or on some special motion for papers. I think it is undesirable that advantage should be taken of the debate on the Address to air these local grievances, which could as well be ventilated at another time. The attack on the policy of the Government is a some-

what different thing. But I mention it now in order to ask hon. gentlemen not to pursue this course to-morrow; it can serve no purpose, and abundant opportunity will be given, so I wish they would choose for it some other time more appropriate. I wish to say that I am desirous of closing the debate upon the Address to-morrow, and I hope I may look to hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to close their remarks to-morrow in order that we may get to the general work of the House. We have now been a week and a day in session, and it is high time the committees were organized and the committee work started. I hope this will meet with general approval, and that we shall endeavour to close to-morrow, even if it should require a late sitting to do so.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes past
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 15th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A RETURN.

REMARKS.

MR. PLUMB said that, on the 10th April last he had given notice of a motion for an Order of the House in respect to a return of all iron purchased for or on behalf of the Government for other than railway purposes, and had moved it on the 16th. He received a letter from the Department asking if he wished to extend the enquiry to British Columbia. He replied that he did not. Then he received another letter asking what particular kind of iron he referred to, and replied to that. No return had been brought down in reply to that request, and he would like to enquire whether such a return had been made in conformity with the Order of the House, and whether it would be brought down to the House without further delay.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not propose to attend to any further business until the Address is passed.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House resumed the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin), said he would not impose upon the good nature of the House in continuing the debate if it were not that he was fully sensible that other hon. members besides himself were desirous of addressing the House. That being the case, he thought he might venture to make a few remarks on the subjects that had excited discussion during the debate. He was a little surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), who paid a high compliment—though probably he did not intend it as a compliment—to his (Mr. Macdougall's) respected and hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He said this debate would not have arisen, nor would it have been prolonged to the great extent it had been, were it not that the member for North Norfolk had been selected to move the resolutions now before the House. He (Mr. Macdougall) thought no higher compliment could have been paid to the hon. member for North Norfolk than the assumption, or rather the declaration, by the hon. member for North Ontario, that the hon. member for North Norfolk had been the means of creating such a disturbance and of drawing forth such eloquence, and logic, and knowledge of the political affairs of this country as had been received from the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. He was sure the hon. member for North Norfolk, and also his constituents, would be highly honoured indeed to know that he had been the occasion and cause of the House and the country having been favoured with such eloquent declamation, such wonderful knowledge of political economy and the whole range of political science, from the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), the Finance Minister in embryo, and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs). He agreed in the expression of deep regret at the near departure of His Excellency the Governor-General,

MR. MACKENZIE.

who has presided with such grave dignity and such great success over the affairs of this country. The beneficial effect of his labours and the discharge of his high duties with such great success would never be forgotten by the grateful people of this country; and he (Mr. Macdougall) only regretted that the circumstances were such as to occasion his withdrawal from Canada. But he had no doubt that the same judgment which characterized the Government which selected His Excellency and placed him in the high position that had been filled by him with such grace would select, as his successor, one who was capable of discharging the grave duties which His Excellency had discharged with such eminent success. He (Mr. Macdougall) was rather amused, on the previous evening, when he heard the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Pope) say he could not support the present Government for the reason that, during the time they had been in office they had not been able to introduce or carry, with the influence they possessed in Parliament, any measure of reform, and that they had not placed on the Statute-book any reform. He would not trouble the House with endeavouring to explain, or rather to contradict, that proposition of the hon. member. He only invited him to look at the Statute-book of the country, and see the Acts that had been passed by this Parliament, under the control and direction of the hon. the Prime Minister, and to say whether, in his judgment, they were not measures which showed that those who devised and introduced them were men of eminent ability, that they had given to the subject the greatest attention; and if the preparation of those measures did not show those men were possessed of the ability which characterized great statesmen. He would not trouble the House to go over with him the number of measures that had been introduced; he would only instance one Act—the Election Act of 1874. That, in itself, had entitled the Government to the respect and appreciation of the people of the country. That measure was passed in the first Session of this Parliament, and along with it was likewise passed an Act for the trial of controverted elections. He

would not refer to any other Acts; he simply referred to those two measures as a specimen of the legislation which the Administration of the day had given to this country. And speaking of the Election Law reminded him—and he did not think it out of place to make some allusion to it here—that it had been stated, in the course of this debate, first by the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell), and again by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) that the Reform party had been guilty, to a large extent, of electoral corruption; and the hon. member for North Hastings put himself to considerable trouble for the purpose of proving that such was the case. As an instance, he referred to the election that took place at London in 1874, and he adduced that as evidence to support his declaration. Now, let them enquire what that election was, who were the candidates, and who was the gentleman stated by the hon. member to be the representative of the Reform interest. With whom was he allied before that election? Was he allied with the Reform party, acquainted with the Reform party, with the practice of the Reform party, with the manner in which they conducted their elections? No; he was associated with the Conservative party; he was associated with the party of which the hon. member for North Hastings was one of the most prominent and brilliant leaders. He was associated with that party, and was one of the bosom friends of the gentleman he afterwards opposed, Mr. Carling, who took a very active part in this House, probably not in the debates or active business, yet still was a great aid to the hon. gentleman who led the House in the Conservative interest at that time. The hon. member for North Hastings said that, at that election of 1874, his quondam friend and ally, Colonel Walker, was guilty of the grossest corruption, that he used money for the purpose of corrupting the electors. For this, the hon. member charged the whole Reform party. He would ask him with whom was Colonel Walker connected before the election? He had not acted with the Reform party, but with the Conservative party; he had acted with the

party to which the candidate he was opposing belonged. And when, after the election contest, the trial came, when the virtuous mind of the hon. member for North Hastings had been so outraged, and his moral sensitiveness had been stunned to such a degree that he could not contro^l his judgment or his feelings, and he came forward to express his awful horror of the corrupt transactions and the manner in which his feelings and the respectability of the community had been outraged in consequence of that election,—he would ask the hon. member why it was that Mr. Carling did not claim the seat; why did he not ask that he should be seated instead of Colonel Walker? It was because his own case would be enquired into. He knew that both he and the man who opposed him used those arguments which told with such force in the Conservative camp, and that they would compel him in the Courts of justice to declare what had taken place; and then, when they added up the figures, when they had the whole secrets of the prison-house exposed, they would have found that the balance was on the other side instead of against Colonel Walker. But all this ado against the Reform party, because Colonel Walker had seen fit to associate with the Reform party since that time, did not arise, he feared, from a virtuous feeling. He had no doubt but that, much as Colonel Walker was calumniated, much as he was pointed at by hon. members as a most detestable example of everything that was bad and wrong, and much as the Reform party had vicariously to suffer for his sin, if he would again return to his first love and ally himself with the Conservative party, they would not be slow to extend the hand of friendship and cordial welcome to him. He could fancy the large-heartedness of the hon. member for North Hastings going out in gushing tenderness to him, and his face lighting up with smiles as he prepared to welcome him back to the ranks of the Conservative party. They had felt his loss the more because he understood their practices so well; because he was a ready scholar, who had graduated in their own school, and because he had learnt to use the weapons that were forged in their

armoury, and had practised all this against them. Hence the virtuous indignation against him; hence the charges made against the Reform party for taking him into their ranks, and the attempt to hold them responsible for what took place at the 1874 election. Now, when the Reform party took credit for having passed the Election Act of 1873, and the Trial of Controverted Elections Act of the same year, the Opposition told them that the right hon. member for Kingston had introduced that measure into Parliament; that he did so after the elections of 1872; that his master-mind and the ability which he possessed in so eminent a degree, and which he (Mr. Macdougall) did not desire to detract from, was devoted to the preparation of a measure of this kind, in order to prevent corrupt practices and punish them with the punishment they so thoroughly deserved. He would admit that the hon. gentleman introduced that measure, and, if he did, there was not the slightest doubt that he understood the measure and its provisions, and how it should be applied in every particular; otherwise, he would not have understood it. He could not for a moment doubt that the hon. gentleman brought to the preparation of that measure his intelligence, his knowledge of law, his accuracy and his profoundness of judgment before submitting it to the House. He assumed that, in every particular, he understood the measure when he introduced it into this House, and was only too ready to do what he possibly could in order that the measure should be carried out faithfully, so that his judgment should be approved by the successful result. Well, it seemed that there was an opportunity of putting his judgment in that respect into force. That opportunity presented itself much sooner than was anticipated or even wished by the hon. members on the other side of the House. When the Act was passed it was not expected that the elections would take place in such a short time. But revelations were made in that House which caused the resignation of the Government of the day, and eventually led to a dissolution of Parliament and an appeal to the

MR. MACDOUGALL.

country. An election took place in the constituency represented by the right hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald), and he was returned. But his seat was afterwards contested; it was submitted that the election had not been carried on in accordance with the law of the day; and this gentleman, who understood all about that law, all about the working of the law, was found to have violated his own provisions, having been found guilty of corruption. There was an opportunity for him to show how far he was desirous that the law should be faithfully carried out, and the sequel showed itself in the election trial in the city of Kingston. The hon. member for North Hastings the other night, probably not so much for the purpose of informing the House as for its going abroad to the country, made certain references to decisions of eminent Judges throughout the land, Judges of the Province of Ontario particularly, who had tried certain contested elections; but, as it happened, these quotations and these judgments were all referring to the Reform party, and were quoted for the purpose of showing that the Reformers, whose seats were contested, were guilty of corruption. If the hon. member was to be the historian of this House and the historian of electoral corruption in the country, he should act fairly in the narrative he gave. Why did not he give some selections from the eminent Judge who tried the Kingston election? Probably he forgot it. He was an impartial man, they knew. He desired to do what was right to both sides of the House. They had ample proof of that from time to time. The fair manner in which he had treated the Reform party, the Premier in particular, proved beyond a doubt that the hon. gentleman had acted fairly, and he (Mr. Macdougall) assumed that he forgot to make any quotations from the decisions of the eminent Judge who tried the Kingston election. He had the highest respect for the hon. gentleman, and trusted that his name would go down to posterity—as no doubt it would—as a fair historian. That being so, he hoped the hon. gentleman would permit him to take the liberty of adding some quotations to those given, so that, as a fair historian,

the hon. member would be able to give a complete narrative of the election frauds of 1874. They were aware, or rather it was intimated to them by hon. members on the other side of the House, that there were several leaders of the Conservative party, that that party was one of great ability, that it was a moving party, an elevating party, a party of progress, and one leader was not sufficient: that it required several leaders in order to manage that wonderful moving and elevating party, and that the hon. gentleman, the member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) was one of its prominent leaders. Now, there happened to be, in another place, a gentleman who occupied a prominent position in the country, who was an eminent lawyer, and well acquainted with political affairs, and who was a close and intimate friend of the right hon. member for Kingston, as well as one of his closest and strongest allies. That gentleman happened to live in Kingston, and, being well acquainted with that constituency, he happened to take a part in the election of 1874; but, when the trial came, and his evidence was highly necessary, in order to complete the true narrative of the electoral depravity of the country which the hon. member for North Hastings had been pleased to give the House—exceedingly necessary in order to effect that object that he should be present at the trial, it was convenient for him to be absent; he was beyond the jurisdiction of the Canadian Courts, and could not be brought forward to give testimony at that trial, testimony which there was not the slightest doubt would have disqualified the chieftain, the great statesman, the leader of the Conservative party of this country. What did the learned Judge say? He said:—

“It clearly appears that the respondent himself contributed \$1,000, and his friends, to his knowledge, a much larger sum, for the purposes of his election; and that a sum probably equal in the whole to \$3,000 was raised for that purpose, the larger part of which passed into Mr. Campbell's hands, a warm personal and political friend of the respondent; that no consultations took place between them as to where or in what way the money should be used, or what, if any, precautions were to be taken to prevent illegal or corrupt use of this large

sum of money; that Mr. Campbell, as far as we know, gave it to all or any of the committeemen that applied for it who were employed in furthering the respondent's election, without any instructions from him as to how it was to be spent, or warnings against any improper use of it; that a great deal of this money was admittedly spent in corrupt purposes, some in direct bribery and in treating, to the extent of voiding the election, and some of the parties who made this improper use of the money, in giving their evidence, spoke of it in a way which might induce those who heard them to suppose that they rather took pride in having violated the law rather than feeling that they had done acts which were culpable, disreputable as far as they were concerned, and seriously injurious to the candidate to whom they pretended to be friendly. It cannot be denied, judging from the demeanour and manner of giving evidence of some of these witnesses, that Mr. Campbell was guilty of great carelessness, if not reckless indifference to consequences, in placing the unrestricted use of considerable sums of money in such hands as these, and in this respect he certainly failed to serve the true interests of the friend for whom he was acting, and apparently showed an indifference as to whether the law of the land was violated or not, which certainly is not commendable, to say the least of it, in a gentleman in his position.”

Why did not the hon. member for North Hastings, with the characteristic fairness he had always shown to this House, give this instance, so that it might have gone down to posterity, as another instance of electoral corruption in the year of grace 1874? Judges were not in the habit of dealing in irony or sarcasm, but plainly stating what they had to say; and, if he (Mr. Macdougall) did not know that to be the case, that Judges simply said what they meant, he should certainly have thought the Judge was dealing in fine irony, when he told the hon. member:

“The fact that the respondent might have relied on Mr. Campbell, as a lawyer and a good business man, not permitting any expenditure that was improper may, perhaps, be something in his favour. But the result shows, as far as we can see, that Mr. Campbell did not take any steps whatever, to prevent improper expenditure, and it might therefore be inferred from his conduct that he thought it best not to take a different course for fear that it might have prejudiced respondent's chance of success in the contest.”

What he wished to draw attention to particularly was this: the fact that the respondent might have relied upon the Hon. Mr. Campbell as a lawyer and a

good business man, not to permit improper expenditures. This might probably be something in the right hon. gentleman's favour. They would notice it was claimed for the right hon. member for Kingston, who introduced this measure, that it was entirely his own. That right hon. member knew all about it. He was the Attorney-General of the day, and the learned judge said he (Sir John A. Macdonald) probably relied upon Mr. Campbell, as a lawyer, to see that things were properly done. The first quotation which he had read pointed out that no instructions whatever were given, and that nothing whatever was said in this regard. He would ask the hon. member for North Hastings whether he (Mr. Bowell) would have done the same under such circumstances; would he not have warned his agents as to what they should do and given them instructions? He had not the slightest doubt that the hon. member would entirely agree with him in regretting that he (Mr. Bowell) had not referred to this decision, and that the hon. member would thank him for having done so in order that the narrative which the hon. member had given to the public might be further supplemented, revised and corrected, by having this desirable addition made to it.

MR. BOWELL: Has the hon. gentleman sufficient honesty to read Mr. Campbell's letter and thus complete the narrative.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he saw no letter in the judgment. He would only ask the hon. member why had not Mr. Campbell appeared at the trial to support the defendant and exculpate the character of the hon. member for Kingston, the chieftain of the great party, from the wonderful charges made against him. He had not the slightest doubt that if it had rested with the pure and impartial mind of the hon. member for North Hastings, who would not allow partizanship to interfere with the proper exercise of his judgment or the discharge of his rightful duties, the Hon. Mr. Campbell would have been present on that occasion. He had only given this as an instance, and he might

MR. MACDOUGALL.

have spoken of others. He thought that, when the right hon. gentleman who introduced this law, who knew all about it and who was one of the first to put it into operation, acted in the way he did, and so far failed to observe the provisions of the law, this showed the object the right hon. gentleman had in introducing it. In connection with the most notable instance that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) had given them of electoral corruption and impurity of election, the person selected was a gentleman who had been associated with the Conservative party in times past. This was one of the Reformers who had been mentioned as guilty of this horrible corruption. He was happy to say that this gentleman had now got into a clearer and purer atmosphere, and was forgetting the things of the past and looking forward to things more hopeful in the future. Being in good company and good society, he had not the slightest doubt that Colonel Walker would improve and probably reach the elevated place of, if he did not go a little higher than, his hon. friend the member for North Hastings. The hon. member for North Ontario, yesterday, had urged that the Government should appeal to the country. That hon. gentleman was exceedingly desirous that the Government should go to the people. He had heard the hon. gentleman express this desire previously; but the time was not far distant when this longing would be gratified, and when he (Mr. Gibbs) and the other members of the House, who saw fit to seek a renewal of the confidence of the people, would have an opportunity of doing so. He did not think that the Reform party were afraid of that emergency, or that they dreaded the consequences. They had had the pleasure throughout the Province of Ontario—he could only speak for his own Province in this relation—of hearing the leaders of both sides of the House appeal to the great electorate of the people. The Conservative leaders had addressed immense demonstrations throughout the country, and the leaders of the Reform party had done the same. The former had first gone through the country iterating and reiterating

their charges against the present Administration, and then the latter had appeared before the people. Both sides of the picture had been presented to the electors and members of both parties had had the opportunity of judging of the capacity, ability and worth of both sides of the House. Before the leader of the Administration had gone through the Province of Ontario, some of them were charged with incapacity. The people had not had the pleasure of seeing some of these hon. gentlemen, who had been so accused, and probably some impression had been made on the minds of the people, by constantly reiterated charges of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and perhaps an impression had been produced in some quarters that these hon. gentlemen were not capable of occupying the prominent positions they held. Notably among these hon. gentlemen—he asked the pardon of the hon. gentleman for this reference—was the hon. the Minister of Finance. Every possible charge had been brought against that hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Cartwright) was accused of incapacity, of mismanagement of the affairs of the country, and with having improperly dealt, owing to incapacity, with the finances of the country. But the hon. gentleman had since visited parts of Ontario where he had never been seen before; and he thought it must be gratifying to him (Mr. Cartwright), as well as to the hon. gentleman's supporters, to know that, where he had been heard, the members of both parties united in declaring that these charges were without any foundation. The hon. gentleman, moreover, held a place in the esteem and respect of all classes of the people, and of all sections of the community which any man, no matter how high his position, might well feel proud of at the present time. He considered that the hon. the Premier of the Dominion had no reason to fear the result in his own Province. The hon. gentleman knew how he had been received by the immense body of the people of the Province of Ontario; he (Mr. Mackenzie) knew the people of his own Province; he knew that the people were moral and intelligent, and that

they could appreciate morality, virtue and intelligence. And the hon. gentleman also knew that in that appreciation, in that gauge or measurement of capacity, he (Mr. Mackenzie) had no reason to dread what the consequences might be. To tell them that a reaction was in progress in the Province of Ontario, and that the Conservatives would carry Ontario, was to tell him something which it was impossible for him to believe and impossible for any old Reformer to believe. The Conservatives had never, in his recollection, carried a majority of the constituencies in Ontario except in the year 1867, and they knew what means were resorted to in order to obtain it; and they also knew that the majority of the Liberal party in Ontario had not been decreased. The hon. member for North Ontario desired the Government to appeal to the country. When the proper time came, the Government of the day would do so. The record and the legislation of the present Administration was well known, and also what the Opposition had done in times past; and the sins and political transgressions of the Opposition would not be forgotten. He assured the House that these political sins of the Opposition would ever be kept prominently before their eyes, in order that they might think of them and ponder over them, and that their repentance might be more intense and more sincere the more frequently references were made to them. A great contrast existed between the two parties, between the hon. gentlemen who occupied seats on the Treasury benches now, and those who occupied them in times past and who sought to occupy them again, and it was to be hoped, in the interests of the country, and of morality, of intelligence, and of general progress, that it might be far, far in the distance, before the hon. gentlemen would have the opportunity of again occupying the positions by which they had degraded the character and the fair fame of the people of this country.

MR. WADE said he would have remained silent, but in consequence of the wide range which the debate had taken, he felt that he would ill discharge his duty if he did not make

some reference to matters which had been brought forward in the course of the discussion. He also felt that he would ill discharge the duty he owed to the county of Digby, which he had the honour to represent, if he did not, at the earliest moment, and at the earliest opportunity which presented itself, reply to the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Militia, who had incorrectly represented to the House the manner in which he had been recently returned to the House. If that hon. gentleman had known the facts of the case, and if he had not been misinformed in this connection, he (Mr. Jones) would not have made the statements to the House that he had. He believed that the hon. gentleman had been misled by the man whom he (Mr. Wade) had defeated. On this hypothesis alone could he account for the way in which the hon. gentleman had addressed the House with reference to the manner in which the recent contest had been carried on in the county of Digby. What were the facts of the case? The late Minister of Militia had gone down to the county of Digby, which had given him (Mr. Vail) its support for eleven years, to see how matters stood in that county. That gentleman knew he had to return to the people for election or rejection, and that he was disqualified, owing to his violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. Some few months before the election took place, he (Mr. Vail) had come down to and gone around the county to discover whether his election was at all certain, for he thought he was warranted in saying that the object was to know whether his seat was safe, for this gentleman dared not meet again the House of Commons until he had purged himself of the disqualification under which he lay. An attempt had been made to surprise the constituency, and the first thing he (Mr. Wade) knew of the new election that was ordered was when he saw the notice, in this relation, posted up at the office of the Sheriff of the county, which office adjoined his own. The county was taken by surprise, and the election, he might say, was ordered without a moment's warning. What had he done? In that county, like in

all others, little difficulties existed, but no sooner were these adjusted—and this was quickly accomplished—than he was unanimously chosen by his party to oppose the late member. He laboured under a great disadvantage in the contest, as the late member had already visited the different portions of the constituency, but these difficulties he had successfully surmounted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was mistaken in saying that he (Mr. Wade) had been returned on the strength of issues outside of and beyond the real questions of the day which were before the people. The issue lay directly between the Government and the Opposition of the day; and on these grounds he had won the seat. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was aware of the position he had taken regarding the railways of the country in the past. He had then acted with due regard for the common interests of the country, and after seventeen days' debate he had announced to the Legislature the position which he took. He assumed the responsibility of the vote he had decided on giving, and on that vote the Government of the day was sustained, and the Opposition prevented coming into office. He then supported the late Joseph Howe, and the leader of the Opposition was the late Judge Johnston. What was his next step? For this he would refer to the hon. member (Mr. Jones). Some years subsequently, he (Mr. Wade) was called upon to enter on a great struggle, which involved no mean issue. It was a question of equal importance to that which concerned the railways of the country; and indeed it far transcended that issue, as it involved the equal, civil and religious rights of the community. What had he then done? Feeling that the party with which he was connected at the time was doing what was wrong with regard to a great public question, he had severed from it, left his hon. friend the late Mr. Howe, and crossed the floor of the House, joining the Opposition. The next great question related to Confederation, which was unpopular with the people of Nova Scotia as had been the railway policy to which he had alluded, at the time when he had taken up his position on

MR. WADE.

it. When this issue came before the House, he occupied the honourable position which Mr. Speaker filled with credit to himself in this house; but he had not taken advantage of his office, as he might have done when that great public question came before the country, and kept silence on the subject. He came down on the floor, while the House was in Committee, and announced his opinion on this great public question of the day, although the feeling of the people in his county was against the position he had assumed on it. He had then taken upon himself the responsibility which he had a right to do, and ought to have done, and thereupon the news went forth upon wings of the press among the people. He was, in consequence, hounded down, and by none more so than by the late member. The opponents of Confederation then said that, if the Province entered the Confederation, the Canadians would gobble it up and ruin it. A portion of the population of the county was imposed upon by misrepresentation, as was the case in all counties, more or less; and to them it was announced that, with Confederation, the very potatoes in the field would be taxed. His electors had been indignant on account of the position he had assumed on this question, but he fully believed that he was right in the stand he had taken. He had acted conscientiously in this matter, and he had looked to the future of this country. He had not been recreant to his duty for the sake of retaining his seat, and he had kept his public record constantly in view. When he came down to the people, however, they did what was their right and privilege, and elected another man in his stead; and this was the late Minister of Militia. This was just the cry that the late member wanted, and on the anti-Confederation cry he carried the constituency. But at the late election they had again met side by side on the hustings, and there he heard the observations made by the late Minister to the electors on the occasion of his re-seeking their suffrages; and he could not refrain from saying that the explanations in question were very meagre. They

were not what he conceived a Minister of the Crown should have given under such circumstances. Mr. Vail had endeavoured to show that he had not been in fault with regard to the printing contract in question; and he had sought to prove that, though disqualified in consequence, and compelled to resign his seat, he had done nothing wrong intentionally, but had merely been the victim of misfortune. Mr. Vail had also attempted to justify the policy of the Administration; and he had then observed to his opponent that no side issues were now in question, and that they were there on a public platform engaged in a fair contest. Mr. Vail was not then there in the guise of an anti-confederate. Those issues were settled, and they both were there to measure swords with regard to the policy of the Government of the day. This was the main issue which was presented in this contest. He trusted that, in his reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), he had clearly placed his position before the House. The hon. gentleman said he had in his pocket letters which stated that side issues had decided this contest in the county of Digby and that they were the cause of his election. He would ask that hon. gentleman to rise in his place and give him the names of those parties; and, if he found that these letters were genuine, he would invite the hon. gentleman to go down to his (Mr. Jones') native county—Digby was not his (Mr. Wade's) native county—and contest the seat with him. If his offer was accepted, he was quite satisfied that the electors of the county of Digby would ask the hon. gentleman to remain at home. Straws showed how the wind blew, and it might be that owing to the result of the present contest in that county, the hon. gentleman would fear somewhat to meet the people. He felt that he had no sins of omission or commission here, because this was his first Session; therefore, in the remarks he had to make, he would lay down the platform on which he intended to act for the future; and however that platform might affect him, he felt that a public duty rested upon him, and, as he had done in the past, he would never flinch from it in

the future, for the man ill-represented a constituency who upon a great public question would sacrifice his public duty to private interests. It was the duty of the Government, instead of coming here on the eve of an election as they had done, to come forward with some measures in regard to the future. Did they intend simply to rest upon their seats? The country generally knew how the Government of the day clung to power; but he said their duty was to arise before this House and give communication of their future policy, in order that the country might decide upon it. But he would not wait for that; he would give his own people the platform on which he would act, and it was—Protection to Canadian Industries, Inter-Provincial Trade and Reciprocity. These were the principles that he would go down to his people with; and, if it was their wish to return him again to this House, it would be upon these grounds. When he had the honour of a seat in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, the party with whom he acted were bound to decide in favour of Confederation; and every man that went back was stricken down, except his hon. friend from Cumberland. He was left alone; but that noble county, the county of Cumberland, said to its member: "Go up there; hold the fort and your country will send you troops; it will send men to help you; hold the fort." He did go; and when the Province of Nova Scotia got a chance to speak out, what did it say? It spoke from away north; the hon. member for that county was the first man that came back here and carried out the views of the people. Last of all came the War Minister of that Administration; and the people of Digby had arisen in their might, and had sent another to reinforce the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said it was not his intention to occupy the attention of the House at this late stage of the discussion, by going through the long speech delivered by the gentleman who had just spoken about his political career, which he thought so creditable to himself, and which was certainly more interesting to him than to the country at large; but still he could not

allow that gentleman's utterances about the late election at Digby to pass unanswered. He was present at that contest himself, and he knew the means that had been resorted to, to defeat Mr. Vail, the late Minister of Militia. He thought that, if there was an election victory that a party ought not to be proud of, it was that one. If the hon. member for Digby thought it was very creditable to himself to have defeated Mr. Vail in the late contest, he was the only man of that opinion who knew something about what had been going on in that county at the last election. As an instance of what he had been saying, he would quote a few lines about a certain individual who appeared to be just now the standard-bearer of Conservatism in the Province of Quebec,—he referred to Mr. Thibault. Mr. Thibault was a notorious character; he was noted all over the Province of Quebec as a most despicable individual, who had not his equal on this continent for rascality.

Mr. MASSON: You will have a chance of saying that before him.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he was not afraid to say that before him, since he said it before the House.

An HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman did not dare meet Mr. Thibault.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he would not so insult the hon. gentleman as to compare him to Mr. Thibault; but he seemed to be one of his followers, for Mr. Thibault seemed to be one of the most important leaders of the Conservative party for some time, and the party were responsible for his utterances. An article published in the *Morning Chronicle* of Halifax, of the 22nd of January last, said:

"Thibault, Dr. Tupper's worthy coadjutor in the Digby contest, to whose good offices the Opposition are so largely indebted for their victory—a man who was driven out of Quebec East for his insulting reference to a lady, and who is one of the worst characters in the Tory ranks—said, in his addresses to the French electors, that he was sent down from Montreal by the Bishops of that place; that he had received a telegram from the Pope himself ordering him to proceed to Digby and evangelize the French people of that county. He read a telegram that was bogus, of course, and said that he had in his pocket a rosary (beads) that had been sent to him by the Pope, as a re-

MR. WADE.

ward for his numerous services in similar circumstances. 'I am no stranger among you,' he said; 'my grandmother was born down here. When only five years of age, I was stolen by the Indians, and now I come back, and old Acadia, my mother, has recognized me. Here is Mr. Fr chet, who is going to speak in Mr. Vail's favour; but you must not believe him, gentlemen, for he has been excommunicated by all the Bishops of his Province, and by the Pope himself. He is a jail-bird and he has been sentenced to twelve years of penitentiary for stealing money, but the Ottawa Government keeps him out to work for the thief Vail, and people of his stamp. Yes, yes, gentlemen, Mr. Vail is a thief who stole \$26,000 of your own money out of the public funds. He is supported only by Protestants and Orangemen.'"

Now, Mr. Thibault was the leader of that famous Conservative party who never allowed any of their members to use religion as a political tool, to serve party purposes. It might be tedious to the House to quote—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Go on, go on.

Mr. MASSON: That should have secured Mr. Vail's election.

Mr. FR CHETTE said that was a very poor compliment to pay the electors of Digby.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Who made that report?

Mr. FR CHETTE: I am not the editor of that paper, sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: The rumour is that the hon. gentleman wrote that report.

Mr. FR CHETTE: Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman pretends that I wrote that report?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I say the rumour is, in Halifax, that you wrote that report.

Mr. FR CHETTE said that rumour was founded on a lie. He neither wrote the report nor inspired it. If the right hon. gentleman wanted another proof of what had been said by Thibault in the county of Digby, he would read another letter, which was published on the 30th of January, in the same paper, coming from a resident in that constituency. Besides that, he could confirm, from the first word to the last, all that this paper said about it, for he was present himself. He dared say that this report was a very mild one indeed, compared

with what was said by that man. Here was a letter signed "A Resident," coming from Digby:—

"He (Thibault) told the people that the Honourable Mr. Vail, not satisfied with his \$8,000 salary, as Minister and representative, had taken \$20,000 from the Treasury for postage; that he had voted to deprive the Catholics of their portion of the school funds, that the leading members of the Government were Freemasons and Orangemen, and were the enemies of the Catholics and the Catholic religion."

Such were the means that were resorted to in order to defeat Mr. Vail in the county of Digby; and now the Tories would boast about having won a great victory. He thought a victory of that kind was more dishonouring to the party and to the individual than the greatest defeat they could meet. He listened on the previous evening with the closest attention to the elaborate and rather long speech delivered by his hon. friend from the county of Quebec (Mr. Caron) which was delivered very fluently, and in a manner most creditable to his ability; but, after the speech he had heard a few days previous from the great pontiff of political Catholicism in the Province of Quebec,—he meant the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin)—and the still more unexpected declarations made by another high priest of the same persuasion, namely, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), he had reason to believe that that most tedious and fatiguing discussion was over; but since the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Caron) had thought proper to bring this delicate question once more before the House, he thought it his duty not to leave his utterances unanswered. He did not, of course, think proper to answer the speeches made by the hon. member for Charlevoix and Hochelaga, for he thought that such an *olla podrida*, as they said in the Spanish language, brought its own refutation in itself. But this was going rather too far, and the House must put an end to such discussions. When the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec came before the House and stated boldly that they never used religion as a political tool for party purposes, they said what was untrue, and they knew it. Such conduct was nothing else but a

repudiation of their principles, of the principles that they had advocated for the last five and twenty years. For twenty-five years the Liberals of the Province of Quebec had made vain endeavours to drag the Conservatives on to political ground, and they never could succeed. For twenty-five years they had had to answer, both on the hustings and in the press, accusations and charges, not against their political creeds, but against their religious persuasions and convictions and nothing else; and these gentlemen were always hidden behind the altar and the priest, and they now came before the House, and, in order, he supposed, to calm the alarms that might have been created in the minds of the Protestants of this country by their fanaticism, they said they never used religion as a political tool.

MR. CIMON: Does the hon. gentleman say that he himself never used religion for political purposes?

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he never did. The matter was so important, and the crisis was so great in the Province of Quebec with regard to that use of religion, that the Sacred Congregation of Rome had sent a most eminent delegate to this country to ascertain whether the Liberals of the Province of Quebec were to be condemned by the Church or not. They had not forgotten,—nobody in that Province had forgotten—how the *mandements* of the Bishops had been so strangely and so falsely interpreted both in the pulpit and on the hustings. There was not a man in the parish of Baie St. Paul, for instance, one of the parishes in the constituency of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), but would remember the famous scapular that was exhibited in the presence of a whole crowd at the church door, during the election of the hon. member—

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman should explain what is a scapular.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: By Mr. Tarte, who was a member of the Local Legislature of Quebec, and the editor-in-chief of the authorized organ in Quebec of the hon. member. Surely there was not one man in the county of Charlevoix but would remember

MR. FRÉCHETTE.

that the hon. member for Charlevoix himself made about the same use of the Cross of St. Gregoire le Grand, which he exhibited before the people so many times, and boasted of having rendered so many great services to the Church, not telling, perhaps, how much he had paid for it.

MR. MASSON: The Pope had been paid to give the cross to Mr. Langevin, I suppose?

MR. FRÉCHETTE said Mr. Langevin had not received that cross from the Pope himself. Surely that gentleman would never deny the use he made of the letter that was written to him by his brother, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Rimouski, in which his opponent, Mr. Tremblay, was treated as a most dangerous man, socially and religiously.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman will be allowed to speak.

MR. BLANCHET: Let him go on. It is the best punishment he can have in this House.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he would say more in the presence of that gentleman who the other day said he never uttered a word of religion; and he would remind him of the fact that in 1863, in his (Mr. Fréchet's) presence, in the parish of St. Bernard, in the county of Dorchester, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) charged the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Taschereau) with the great crime of not going to confession often enough. He (Mr. Fréchet) heard that with his own ears; and yet that hon. gentleman would come here and say he never heard the word religion made use of in politics. He said shame on him, and on that famous circular that was quoted the other day, by the gentleman he had just referred to—the famous circular that was spread by thousands over the county of Charlevoix, in which the Judges of the Supreme Court were so roughly handled. The House had heard the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) rising from his seat and saying that

that circular had been printed in a Liberal establishment. Perhaps the hon. gentleman said that as a joke, and he would give him the benefit of the doubt. But, if he said that as truth, and if the hon. gentleman would stand up and repeat it seriously, he could but tell him that he was worthy of having on his forehead the stigma—he would not say the word, because it would be unparliamentary, but it was true. He would not go on quoting all the papers in which the Liberal party had been represented as being opposed to the Church and opposed to all good religious principles. It would be a bad compliment to pay to this House to suppose that they were not aware of this fact, that for the last twenty-five years at least it had been the tactics of the Conservative press of the Province of Quebec to represent their opponents as men utterly unworthy of public confidence, as far as their religious principles were concerned. If he were to quote only the articles of the *Nouveau Monde*, which was edited by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), in which the Liberals of the Province of Quebec were represented as communists, as heretics, and as men of the worst character, he would have to quote a whole fyle. An hon. member had said in his speech the other day, that the Liberals had gone from presbytery to presbytery, from Bishop's palace to Bishop's palace, begging for the support of the clergy. That was utterly false.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. member could not apply such language to the House, for it was quite unparliamentary.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said that, if the word "false" was unparliamentary, he would substitute the phrase "utterly incorrect," and he denied the statement most emphatically. They had done their best by using all honest and legitimate means to destroy the prejudices that had been created in the minds of a certain portion of the clergy by unscrupulous opponents; and to demonstrate to that portion of the clergy that the Liberals were no more the enemies of Christ and religion than were the Opposition; but they never went round to presbyteries in order to

obtain some clerical influence in their favour at the election. But he knew that a certain gentleman belonging to the city of Montreal, an editor and representative of the county of Hochelaga, went round from committee-room to committee-room, begging the support of the Liberals, in order to secure his election by acclamation, and he succeeded. That hon. gentleman deceived the Liberals so much as to induce them to allow him to be returned by acclamation, and now, he never missed an opportunity of slandering those to whose influence he owed the seat he now occupied.

MR. SPEAKER: The word "slandering" is unparliamentary.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said the hon. gentleman quoted the other day a letter from Mr. Mercier in order to establish that the Liberals who belonged to the Province of Quebec were just as strong Catholics as the Conservatives, and consequently just as dangerous as the Conservatives to the Protestants. What could they think of a man who occupied his life in abusing his fellow-countrymen in regard to religious questions, and who afterwards came to the House and denied the fact. What could they think of a man who, as a journalist, would take every opportunity of representing his countrymen as men of no character or standing, and very dangerous men socially and religiously; and then, when he took his seat in the House, stated that those men were just as good as the Conservatives in their religious convictions. What could they think of a man who declared to the Catholics of the Province of Quebec that the Liberals were the enemies of their creed, and that they sided with the Protestants, and yet declared in the House that the Liberals were as strong Catholics as the Conservatives, and, therefore, as dangerous. Surely, if there existed what was termed by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) a party of organized hypocrisy, it was not on that side of the House, for such a conduct of the Conservative leaders was double hypocrisy. He defied the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) to publish *in extenso* in the *Nouveau Monde*, which was the organ

of a certain religious faction in Montreal, the speech he made in the House the other day. He defied him to publish the speech delivered by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) in which he declared that the doctrines of the Bishop had had nothing to do with the late contest in Drummond and Arthabaska. It was perhaps in anticipation of those speeches that the right hon. member for Kingston suggested at the opening of the Session that the speeches should not be reported in full, and he was perhaps wise in that regard.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he felt grateful to the hon. gentlemen opposite for the good character given by them to the Quebec Liberals. For a long time they had been endeavouring to impress on the minds of the people of the Province that the Liberals were no more the enemies of the Church than the Conservatives of the same Province; and for a long time they had endeavoured to remove from the minds of the people the prejudices that had been created by the utterances of the Conservative press in respect to that matter. Since they acknowledged the fact, he was glad that the matter was now at rest. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Caron) regarding the Liberal leaders, it was strange to say that that hon. member did not find fault because they had no leaders but because they had too many. While he might tell that hon. gentleman that that was not his business, but that of the Quebec Liberals, he would say that in their camp they chose for leaders men of great ability and unspotted character, and if they had many of them it was so much the better for the Liberal party and for the country. If the hon. gentleman was unable to make the same statement with regard to his own party, he (Mr. Fréchet) tendered him his sincere sympathies, but that was not his fault. He would allude to the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix in respect to Protection. That hon. member, who once was the leader of the Conservative

MR. FRÉCHETTE,

party in Quebec, had stated that the Conservative party always stood by their flag and never changed their principles; and alluded to Sir George Cartier, his predecessor in the leadership of the Tory party of the Province, as a great Protectionist. He would quote some remarks from a speech delivered by Sir George Cartier in the presence of the hon. member for Charlevoix, on the 23rd December, 1869, at a banquet given to him by the English merchants of Quebec. Sir George Cartier said:

"Manufacturers frequently ask for Protection. It is absurd, as is also the notion of extreme Free-trade. As to it, you must pay the amount of your duty to the Government by direct taxation. With extreme Protection you destroy your foreign trade, as the Americans have done, and this again leads to direct taxation. We are not going to commit such a folly. We have adopted the proper policy of imposing merely an income duty, not a protective one."

On the same occasion the hon. member for Charlevoix said:—

"He agreed entirely with what Sir George had stated, and as far as he was concerned would endeavour to carry out his leader's policy."

Nevertheless, that hon. member would no doubt rise in his seat from time to time during the Session, and declare that the Conservative party had always held the same principles and views respecting the tariff question. That quotation was sufficient to show that the hon. member was far from accurate when he made that statement. He wished to say in conclusion that in his reference to the cross exhibited by the hon. member for Charlevoix during his election, he did not mean to say that he had paid any money to the Pope for it, as was so uncharitably insinuated by the hon. member for Terrebonne, but he alluded to what it had cost in solicitation and influence displayed.

MR. MASSON said he did not insinuate anything. The hon. member had used the words "paid for it."

MR. LAURIER said that, when a hon. member rose and wished to explain what he meant by using certain words, his motives should not be impugned.

MR. MASSON said he had not impugned anybody, but had stated a fact.

MR. BLANCHET said that, after the painful exhibition which the House had witnessed, it was almost unnecessary to say a word. After such a spectacle as the House had seen, when the friends of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) were bowing their heads with shame, he thought the best punishment would be to allow the hon. member to proceed without answer, because, if he was amenable to right sentiments, it would be the greatest punishment he had ever received in his life. The hon. gentleman had uttered expressions which were unworthy of the British or Canadian Parliament, and more suitable to a Jacobin club. Never in any British Parliament or in this country were expressions uttered so insulting to the head of the Church as those uttered by the hon. member for Lévis. That hon. gentleman would not receive the congratulations of his friends for his speech, and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would soon find out that he had caught a Tartar. Some few years ago, in 1873 he thought, the hon. member for Lévis, in addressing a meeting in St. Roch, Quebec, used, respecting the late Sir George Cartier, that illustrious Canadian, true patriot and father of his Province, who had died some few months before, the expression of *charoigne*.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I deny that most emphatically.

MR. BLANCHET: You cannot deny it.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I do deny it.

MR. BLANCHET said it need not, therefore, be surprising that the hon. gentleman was now able to use such expressions as he had applied toward the head of the Catholic Church. The aspirations of that hon. member were very great. He was born in the Province of Quebec and in the county of Lévis, and his countrymen of that locality were not very much honoured by the position he had taken to-day. After practising his profession for a few years he proceeded to Chicago, and returned one day as a carpet-bagger—he used the term in a parliamentary sense—and presented himself to the county of Lévis, for parliamentary honours. The first document

that hon. gentleman took from his pocket was a certificate from a Roman Catholic priest of Chicago, named Côté, who was a respectable priest, stating that the present hon. member for Lévis was a good Catholic, and attended the sacraments of the Church. That was very good, and he did not blame the hon. gentleman for it; but it showed that, when he found it necessary to obtain the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy, he sought it. The hon. gentleman came back from Chicago with the reputation of being a great poet and orator. The House would be able to judge whether he had shown himself a great orator to-day. The hon. the Minister of Justice had quoted a fable from Le Fontaine. There was another fable in his writings, describing, in his excellent language, how a stick floating on the waves resembled at a distance a vessel, but on approaching the shore it was found to be only a floating stick. The hon. gentleman much resembled that stick. He was a bag of wind.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BLANCHET said he used the phrase in the parliamentary sense of the word. "At a distance, it is something, but near at hand it is nothing." The hon. gentleman was not over-disciplined by his party. Last year, when Mr. Pelletier was chosen a Minister, rumour said that the hon. member for Lévis telegraphed to the hon. the Premier at Ottawa, stating that he would not accept Mr. Pelletier. He did not know whether such was true or not, but it was so stated. When the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue accepted a portfolio, the hon. member for Lévis accepted him, saying: "Let him pass—my turn will come." But he was convinced that, if that hon. member did not show more respect, decency, ability and sense of honour, he would never have a portfolio in any Cabinet, and he was satisfied the electors would send him to the right about.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: What about the county of Bellechasse?

MR. BLANCHET said he would refer to his county. He was elected in 1875, after the appointment of Mr.

Justice Fournier to the Supreme Court, and of all the candidates who presented themselves not one dared pledge himself a supporter of the present Government. Even a young lawyer of Quebec—Mr. Larue—president of the Institut Canadien, who invited the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to deliver his celebrated address at Quebec, where he was recognized as the leader of the Liberal party of Quebec, presented himself as an independent candidate. He did not dare to endorse the measures and policy of the Government. He had told his friends not to appear in the county, or say a word in his favour, because it might compromise him and prove injurious to him. It was only on the Sunday, two days before the election, they appeared, seeing there was no danger, and endeavoured to rally in favour of their friend the little popularity left to the Government. But not one of the many candidates in the county dared to support the policy of the Government. The hon. member for Lévis had thought fit to read extracts from the newspapers of Nova Scotia relating to Mr. Thibault. He (Mr. Blanchet) had not the honour to know Mr. Thibault. He had, however, read some songs written by the hon. member for Lévis against that gentleman.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: That is another statement I deny.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. member was known to make a little poetry, and it was naturally said that those songs were made by him. However, he accepted the denial. While he did not know Mr. Thibault, he was satisfied the hon. member for Lévis would not dare to utter in Mr. Thibault's face the expressions he had uttered to-day. He did not dare in the last election to meet Mr. Thibault in Digby, and the hon. member for Lévis came back from that county,

"Honteux comme un renard qu'une poule aurait pris;

Serrant la queue, et portant bas l'oreille."

Mr. Thibault had been made a great man by hon. gentlemen opposite, and would very probably be in the House next Parliament to meet the hon. member for Lévis if he had the honour of a

MR. BLANCHET.

seat in the House. Mr. Thibault had denied altogether the speech which was put in his mouth by the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*. The respect enjoyed by Mr. Thibault in Montreal was shown by the fact that he was a member of the Montreal City Council and a lawyer of standing in that city. He read a certificate signed by members of the bar of Montreal, amongst them Messrs. Kerr and Laflamme, stating that Mr. Thibault was a lawyer of good standing, who could represent the Crown in criminal cases. The hon. gentleman had referred to the charge against him of trying to use the influence of the clergy. Now he (Mr. Blanchet) had been informed that in 1875 the hon. member went down to Chicoutimi, where there was an election going on for the Local Legislature, between Mr. Price and Mr. Guay, and that in an address to the French electors the hon. member said that it would be a shame for the Catholics to vote for a Protestant like Mr. Price.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: That I deny; there is nothing in it.

MR. CIMON said he heard the hon. member for Lévis, in the county of Chicoutimi, make that statement during the local election of 1875, to the people there. The candidates were Mr. Price and Mr. Guay, the former being a Protestant and the latter a Catholic. The hon. member for Lévis went down to the county accompanied by Mr. Tremblay, the late member for Charlevoix. At the meetings in the county Mr. Tremblay repeated the statement made by the hon. member for Lévis—that it was a shame for a French Canadian Catholic constituency to elect a Protestant to the Local Legislature. Mr. Price was, however, returned by 500 majority, though there were not more than 15 Protestant votes in the whole county.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: The hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat (Mr. Cimon) must have been greatly mistaken. I never in my life uttered such a word. I tell him he must have been mistaken, or else he does something worse than committing a mistake.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. member for Lévis had, in the course

of his remarks, paid a poor compliment to the Province of Quebec in stating that there were no leaders in the Liberal party. The same remark had been made by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue a few days ago. He stated, moreover, that they recognized no leader of the Quebec Liberals, except the hon. the Premier, who was worthy of the position of leading that party in the whole Dominion. The hon. member for Lévis had stated that the Liberals chose, as their leaders, men of the highest talent and eminence. He (Mr. Blanchet) admitted that Sir A. A. Dorion, now Chief Justice of Quebec, was a man of high standing, great ability and great personal worth. If no leaders had been chosen since that time, was it because no hon. member was considered qualified to occupy the position? If that were so, and he (Mr. Blanchet) did not hold that view, it was certainly not a high compliment to the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. He thought he had said enough with respect to the hon. member for Lévis, whom he would now leave with Mr. Thibault, and perhaps that gentleman, whom the hon. member seemed to despise, would meet him, if not in his own county, at some other place, and when they were face to face Mr. Thibault would prove a match for the hon. member. With respect to the Address itself, it mentioned many matters which the House took for granted; but he could not concur in the paragraph which announced that the crisis under which the country had been suffering, and was still suffering, was passing away. For his part he protested against that part of the Address. It was not because the revenue of our ports had increased that the people saw that there was a change and improvement in the affairs of the country; and, if they visited any city in the Dominion—he did not speak, of course, of the rural population, which had been blessed this year with an abundant harvest, for which they thanked Providence, though the unfortunate farmers had no market for the advantageous sale of their produce—if they went to any of our cities they would see that the commercial depres-

sion had not passed away. A glance at Ottawa would reveal the same state of affairs which prevailed all over the Dominion; and he observed by the newspapers that the Government were paying the travelling expenses of labourers from Ottawa to Montreal to afford them the advantage of working on the Lachine Canal. The hon. member for Lévis might look to his own county and he would see at Quebec the manufacturers struggling and doing their best to tide over the depression, but, unfortunately, as had been stated by several hon. members, in spite of their efforts and their expressions of satisfaction with the present Government, they had been obliged to liquidate their estates and come to terms with their creditors. The hon. the seconder of the Address had mentioned the United States as an example of the injurious effects of a protective policy. The hon. gentleman, he supposed, had not seen resolutions adopted some days ago at Pittsburg, where thousands of people from the Western States had assembled to protest against the tariff as proposed to be passed in the American Congress, though it was far from being a Free-trade tariff. Those men belonged to the Western States, where there was the most moderate number of Protectionists, and yet they had passed resolutions in favour of Protection and, entering a protest against the tariff, had sent it to Congress declaring Protection to be a necessity. The same course must be followed by Canada, which should no longer follow an abstract theory. Protection and Free-trade were in themselves abstract propositions, and in practice it was impossible to apply to any country the absolute principle of Free-trade or Protection. If they endeavoured to give every country Free-trade it would be equivalent to dressing every man and woman in a dress of the same size, which was impossible. There must be commercial tariffs and laws framed according to the conditions of the country to which they were to be applied. What was good for one country was injurious to another. Free-trade was a very good policy for England, but bad for Canada; indeed, it was impossible for a new country to

adopt a principle of Free-trade; and, though the hon. the First Minister had stated at Montreal and Hamilton that he was in favour of the principle of Free-trade, yet he recognized the necessity of Incidental Protection for the interest of this country. In regard to the programme of the Parti National, it was well known that in 1872 a new party was organized in the Province of Quebec bearing that name. Why it was called National no one could say. It was not French, or English, or Rouge. Whether they were Annexationists or not he did not know. He supposed they were not; but they wanted to gain power by all means. The leaders of the Liberal party, and the leaders of the Rouges, were so much compromised in the Province of Quebec that they thought it proper to arrange the theatre in some other shape and change the scenes. Mr. Dorion was then in Europe; his name was not mentioned in the programme, but new men and new ideas were adopted and the programme was published. The gentlemen who were at the head of the party in Quebec were Mr. Joly, who was now leader of the Liberals in the Local Legislature; Mr. De St. Just, now Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec; Mr. Langelier, who had for near two years had a seat in the Local Legislature, and Mr. Laurier and some others were the members of the committee appointed to frame the programme.

MR. LAURIER: I never saw it.

MR. BLANCHET said that though the hon. gentleman was perhaps not consulted, yet he (Mr. Blanchet) read in the *Herald* of 1872 that, on the formation of the National party, the name of the hon. gentleman was mentioned as one of the Committee charged with its organization.

MR. LAURIER: My name might be mentioned, but I never approved of it.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. gentleman repudiated the programme which was his own child. It was always the way with the Liberals of Quebec; they had been obliged to repudiate one day what they had pro-

mulgated the previous day. He would not enter into the programme of 1847, which was disavowed last night, or speak of the programme of 1854, which was too strong for the time; but he would refer to the programme of 1872.

MR. MILLS: You supported that programme.

MR. BLANCHET: Which?

MR. MILLS: That of 1854.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. the Minister of the Interior should not make that statement. With regard to the programme of 1872, the first article was "Election of Senators by the people or Local Legislatures." He would like to know if the hon. the Minister of the Interior had abandoned the scheme for the re-organization of the Senate.

MR. MILLS; I have not.

MR. BLANCHET said that, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's disavowal, he did not see anything in the Speech respecting that subject. If the Senate was such a useful machine in the State, he (Mr. Blanchet) saw no reason why they should change its constitution, and the expression used by the hon. the Minister of the Interior would tell against him when he was again out of power and endeavouring to be returned to Parliament. It would be said that in such a year the hon. member admitted that the Senate was a good institution, that there was no necessity for calling the House together because affairs were not extraordinary, and that all for which Parliament was required to assemble was for voting the money necessary for the public service.

MR. MILLS: The Speech does not say that.

MR. BLANCHET said the Speech recognized that we were in ordinary times, and that everything was going on well. If such were so, why should they change the constitution of the Senate? The second article of the programme was "Reform of the Electoral Laws of the Dominion, and of the Province of Quebec." He admitted that the Electoral Laws had been changed since that pro-

MR. BLANCHET.

programme was adopted in 1872, but the Act relating to Controverted Elections was passed in 1873 by the present Opposition party, led by the right hon. member for Kingston. The law relating to the ballot, and the law relating to the holding of elections on one day, and the abolition of the property qualification, he admitted, were passed in 1874. But it was the only article in the programme they had sustained since they were in power. The third article of the programme was the reduction of the number of Ministers. The present Government had been in power during four years, and no measure had been proposed to diminish the number of Ministers. He did not know whether the late President of the Council had resigned in order to carry out that article; but if they were to believe the newspapers it was not so, because it was stated that the hon. gentleman would not be replaced during the Session, but immediately afterwards, and before the general elections. The fourth article of the programme was in favour of "A reduction of the salary of the Governor-General." He did not observe anything mentioned in the Speech from the Throne regarding that matter, and no proposition had been made during the last four years the present Government had been in power, to have the salary reduced. It was only clap-trap. No one in the House thought of or wished for a reduction in the salary of the Governor-General. The sum granted was necessary to maintain that high functionary who was at the head of the Dominion in his proper place and position; and he was satisfied that no one would suppose that, if the present party was in power ten years hence, any member would come forward with a proposal to diminish the Governor-General's salary.

MR. MILLS: It would be a great disappointment to you.

MR. BLANCHET said the country resolved to maintain the present salary of the Governor-General in 1868. The fifth article of the programme was for "Reducing the number of public employes." He did not see, however, that any change had been affected in that respect; the same number of

employes still crowded the lobbies of the House, and the corridors of the Public Departments as some years ago, when the hon. the Premier stated that he was choked by the crowd of functionaries in the corridors and passages of the House. This was one more article in the programme of the National party which there had been no attempt to carry out. The next article in the programme promised "A re-organization of the Militia," in such a way that the force should only be used for the maintenance of public order. Perhaps they had carried out the article in that respect, because they had allowed the number of the militia to dwindle down to almost nothing; but he was sure, in spite of the Liberal party of Quebec, though the Government had thought proper to let the force diminish, he was afraid they would by this time have seen it was not a very wise policy. The seventh article of the programme was "Improvement of the internal ways of communication, so as to increase the facilities for trade by the St. Lawrence route." Every one was agreed with regard to that subject; it was the policy of both political parties, and had been carried out in good faith by the present party in power, though it had been first adopted by the present Opposition when in office. Then another article was: "Opposition to the construction of the Pacific Railway by Government grant until the North-West Territory was colonized." He did not observe that any change had been made in reference to the construction of that railway, except that the Government had given up the policy of the last Administration to have the line constructed by a private company, and had adopted the policy of having it constructed as a Government work. He admitted that it was a wise policy, and, indeed, the only possible policy to get such a large undertaking carried out by the country. The policy of the Government, or rather the policy of the First Minister, was the construction of the Pacific Railway, in spite of his colleagues, the members of the Government, and the members of the Liberal party of Quebec. Another article in the programme of the Parti National was "The obtaining of the

absolute right to negotiate our commercial relations with other countries so as to secure the establishment of manufactories in Canada." The answer given last summer by the hon. the First Minister to a deputation of gentlemen from Quebec interested in ship-building was in conflict with that article. He told them it was impossible for Canada to do anything in that regard except through Great Britain, and yet, a few months afterwards, owing to the election for Quebec, he changed his views, and wrote a letter to Mr. Shehyn, which had been read to the House, stating that he would give him power to write to the French Consul and arrange an informal treaty so as to secure to Canada reduced dues on Dominion ships entering French ports. The letter read as follows:—

"As you seem to think that some arrangement or understanding may be arrived at, though not formally concluded, with the French Consul, I need hardly say that I would be very glad indeed to have you communicate with that gentleman in any way you think best; and, if anything can be done through him to facilitate the object we all have in view, to secure close commercial relations with France in articles produced by both countries, I shall be very glad."

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear; I have no objection to that.

MR. BLANCHET said that in the previous interview the hon. the First Minister had stated that the fullest representation had already been made to the French Government, through the only constitutional channel, and the Government of Canada could not delegate any person to represent them in any foreign country. It was sufficient to say that the hon. gentleman expressed that view on the 3rd August, 1877, and the view contained in the letter addressed to Mr. Shehyn, on the 10th November.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member is quite mistaken. The two statements are quite consistent. The House will observe that I stated—what I state now, and what I must of necessity state—that there could be no official communication held by the Government of Canada, or anybody appointed by the Government of Canada, with any foreign Government. They must of necessity go through the usual chan-

MR. BLANCHET.

nels; and I simply stated in the letter to Mr. Shehyn that if anything could be done through the French Consul that might facilitate the object we have in common, I should be very glad, as I should be now.

MR. BLANCHET: Through the French Consul or the British Ambassador at Paris?

MR. MACKENZIE: Any way you like.

MR. BLANCHET said that statement was entirely contrary to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman to the deputation that waited on him from Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not at all.

MR. BLANCHET said he had risen because he thought it was his duty to answer the remarks of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) which were so unwarranted and unparliamentary; and he was sure that the hon. gentleman's electors, when they read in the newspapers the expressions used by him in that House, would be ashamed of him—as his colleagues were—and would not again return him as a member of that House.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I rise to make a personal explanation. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blanchet) has thought proper to talk a little of religion, and with regard to his misfortune in the county of Lévis; and he stated that, in 1871, during the local election, I had used a letter coming from a priest of Chicago, in which I was represented as being a good Catholic. I say it is utterly incorrect: I never used any such letter.

MR. BLANCHET: He is ashamed of it now.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I only interrupted the hon. member to deny his incorrect statement. I say that, in 1871 or 1872, I had to publish in the newspapers a certain letter coming from a French priest in Chicago denying a certain letter that had been published at the suggestion or instigation—

MR. BLANCHET: No, no.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: Or at the instigation of the hon. member's party, in the county of Lévis, a letter in

which I was represented as a man who had betrayed his religion and become a Protestant; that was published in *L'Echo de Lévis*. It was only in reply to that letter, published by the hon. member for Bellechasse, or his party, that I published the letter from the Chicago priest.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that before the House adjourned he wished to call attention to the fact that, as the time for receiving petitions and private bills expired on Monday, it had become an absolute necessity to close the debate that evening in order that they might be able to get the committees organized. He was sure everyone would recognize the necessity of doing this. He had interfered with the debate as little as possible, nor had he had an opportunity to speak himself, except a few words in reply to the Opposition. He asked hon. gentlemen to consider the position in which the House was placed, and to make a point of closing the debate that evening.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said it was not his intention to take part in the debate, for he conceived that the discussion had gone far beyond the limits of the Address; nor was there anything of sufficient importance in the Address to His Excellency, that called, in his opinion, for so lengthened a debate. But two or three members on the opposite side of the House, commencing with the hon. the Postmaster-General, and ending with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Macdougall), had referred in so unfair and unjust a manner to the Hon. Mr. Campbell that, in this hon. gentleman's absence, he conceived it to be his duty towards his absent friend to read for him the defence which he (Mr. Campbell) offered at the time. The Hon. Mr. Campbell had been accused by the hon. the Postmaster-General and the hon. member for East Elgin, of having fled to escape the service of a process or subpoena in con-

nection with the trial of the election petition versus the right hon. member for Kingston. At the time, the *Globe* had made this accusation against the hon. Senator, who had replied in the following letter, dated Nov. 2, 1874:—

"SIR,—The conclusion to which you jump in the article on the Kingston Election Trial in this morning's *Globe*, that, because I was not present at that investigation, I had made what you term a 'fight' to avoid it, is, I venture to say, excessively unfair. I was in Montreal up to Saturday evening last. I had had no intimation of any kind that my presence would be needed or my evidence desired at Kingston. The business which called me to New York involved the meeting on last Tuesday of several gentlemen from different parts of the United States, and one who sailed for England by the *Prussian* on Wednesday. It had been agreed, towards the end of October, that we should meet when and where we did. Surely, in the absence of any subpoena, telegram or other intimation that my presence was desired at Kingston, I was at liberty to go where my private affairs called me without exposing myself, in any reason or fairness, to comments such as those contained in your article.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. CAMPBELL.

"Toronto, November 2nd, 1874."

He thought that, with this letter before the hon. gentlemen in question, they ought to have hesitated before they criticised the conduct of that hon. Senator in such a manner; and he submitted that letter as a sufficient vindication of his character from those aspersions. The hon. member for East Elgin had quoted at some length, from the judgment of that eminent judge, Chief Justice Richards, in connection with this case. He would like to supplement these remarks by a very brief article from the *Globe*, which said:

"The very elaborate judgment of Chief Justice Richards in the case of the Kingston election petition, which we published this morning, declares the election void, and relieves the respondent, Sir John A. Macdonald, of all responsibility attaching to actual and express knowledge of the illegal and corrupt proceedings of his agents."

He conceived that this also sufficiently indicated the fact that his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in no way responsible further than the law implied for the conduct of his agents, who were, as the hon. gentleman opposite said, too zealous in the cause. He

would tell the hon. gentlemen opposite who had alluded to the Kingston election of 1874, that, if they knew the facts connected with these elections, they would hesitate to bring those elections into discussion before the House. These two elections which were held in 1874, were the very last elections to which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House should refer. He was acquainted with some of the facts connected with them, and he believed that never, in the history of Canada, was the power of the Government so prostituted as it was in these cases, in attempting to intimidate and corrupt the electors of any constituency. More open or more shameless intimidation had never been practised in Canada. Even a Minister of the Crown had not thought it beneath his dignity to enter the public departments on the day of polling and allow the voters in his presence to be canvassed, with a request in his name that they should go to the polls and vote for the Government candidate. One, at least, of those officials had been so intimidated that he actually took refuge in the coal cellar; and another official who had the manliness to say "No," to the request, had suffered for it to this day, he having had officials put into his department over his head, and placed in the receipt of higher salaries, although he was competent in every respect to fulfil the duties of a higher position. He would not allude to the case of an individual who was dismissed from his position because he ventured to vote for the right hon. member for Kingston,—on the ostensible ground that this official had canvassed for the right hon. gentleman. This official was not a member of any committee, nor had he attended any public meetings; and it was simply because, among his private friends, he stated his mind freely, that this man suffered dismissal from the public service with the ignominy attached of the announcement in the public *Gazette*, that His Excellency the Governor-General had no further need for his services. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) could also tell the House of acts of corruption committed by the Ministerialists at these elections. On the very day of nomination, at the second

MR. KIRKPATRICK,

election, opposite to the building in which the nomination took place, and within hearing of the persons who addressed the meeting, workmen, labourers and voters began to pull down the fortifications; and these men were then so engaged on the part of the Government, not by tens, or twenties, or fifties, but by hundreds. And these men were employed through tickets given them by the committee of the Government candidate, and it was said to them: "Here is the Government giving you work." He thought the right hon. gentleman was correct the other night when he said he was thankful to secure his election by a majority of seventeen; and he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) could add that those who supported the right hon. gentleman in that city were thankful for it too, when they considered the means used to defeat him. The demolition of these walls was also commenced at the period of the election, before the ice had formed, in order to give the carters and teamsters double work. If they had waited until the ice had formed, they could have removed the stones, which were said to be required on the opposite side of the bay, by a direct cut across the bay. These stones were removed to a certain distance, where they were piled up, and then, a fortnight afterwards, another job was given in their removal across the bay. These were facts which were well known in Kingston, and, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had known these facts as they were known to the people of Kingston, they would have been very careful about referring to that election and to the diminished majority by which the right hon. member was returned. He regretted his having been obliged to introduce this subject; and he also regretted the introduction of these subjects into this debate.

MR. ORTON said it was not his intention to follow hon. gentlemen in their wise or unwise course, by entering into fulsome praise of the political party to which he belonged, or into charges of corruption or personal recrimination, because he thought that at the present time the people of this country had made up their minds in reference to the accusations which had

been made. At any rate, this was the case in Ontario, where the people were perfectly familiar with all the circumstances connected with these charges on both sides. He thought the people had made up their minds that though the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) might have, in political contests, committed a wrong, this had been far more than counterbalanced by the exhibition which had been made by the other side of the House before the Election Courts, and also by the acts of the Administration since it came into power; such as, for instance, the steel rails transaction, the Goderich Harbour job, and the Fort Frances swindle. He believed that the country expected something more from the Government than the making of charges against their opponents. It expected from the Administration some broad and expansive scheme for raising this country out of the cloud of depression which weighed so heavily on our commercial and industrial classes. The first paragraph of the reply to the Address was as follows:—

“That we learn with satisfaction, that His Excellency, in again summoning us for the despatch of business, is able to inform us that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires our attendance.”

This clause, in conjunction with one or two other clauses in the Address, he thought sufficiently indicated that the present Government did not consider that the great financial distress, the continuation of the hard times which had been pressing so heavily upon the people of this country, required any exertion on their part. This was indeed a humiliating confession on the part of the Government of their own inertness and their utter inability to grasp the wants and requirements of the people of this country, or to enter into the genius and spirit of the people of Canada. It would be well for them to consider for a short time some of the reasons which had led to the many years of commercial despondency and general distress that had prevailed in this country. He thought it would be generally acknowledged that these were the causes of the depression: first, over importations; second, imports of shoddy or worthless goods; third, the unfair

tariff relations that existed between this country and the United States; fourth, the great increase in the cost of Government since Confederation; fifth, the high rate of interest that was exacted in this country; and, sixth, the policy of the present Government which had been such as to decrease the volume of our foreign trade, and to assist, as far as the Government could do, the other causes in bringing about this depression. The Government seemed to be of opinion that all this was utterly beyond their control, but he considered the people of this country believed that any Government in which they could have confidence, must exert themselves and endeavour to remove these causes of depression. He thought there were few intelligent business men in Canada but felt that the Government should at least do something to give some little ray of hope to our struggling industries. He thought it would be acknowledged, in the first place, that over-importations could be reduced; and one way of doing that was to re-arrange the tariff so as to collect the taxation which was required to carry on our affairs in a manner that would be less burdensome to the people. Such a re-arrangement could be made as would give encouragement to every class of our population, whether labourers, who, at present, all over the country, were only half employed—able-bodied, willing men, who were left unproductive, and in many instances were unable to provide their families with the necessaries of life—or the great agricultural class of the country, who felt they had not received that justice they had a right to demand from the Government. He believed that the Government could control the importation of shoddy goods and their manufacture in this country. Some scheme might be inaugurated by which that drain on our national wealth would be reduced or stemmed. A scheme to prevent the importation of shoddy goods would meet with the general approval of the people of Canada. The tariff question had been ably discussed in the House, and it was likely that during the present Session this matter would receive full consideration from both sides of the House. The high rate of

interest exacted should receive the earnest and serious consideration of Parliament. It was well known that our people were weighed down by the heavy interest they had to pay; and it was also a notorious fact that nearly two-thirds of the property in Canada was to-day mortgaged, to a large extent to foreign capitalists. They also knew that certain societies in this country were carrying on operations with the sanction and approval of the Government; and these institutions had done a great deal of injury to the progress of many of our most industrious and worthy people. Many instances in his experience had occurred where men who had for years struggled hard on farms in Western Canada, in order to make for themselves and their families a home, had had that property ruthlessly taken away from them through the operations of these societies. One farmer had mortgaged his farm for \$2,000; and, after paying a large amount in fees and other costs to obtain the money through this mortgage, which was taken on the principle of the building societies, namely, payable in twenty years in annual instalments, interest the same every year after paying for three years both interest and principal, the failure of his crops had obliged him to sell his place to enable him to meet the fourth instalment. To sell he required to have the mortgage released; but, when he applied to the society for such relief—and a lawyer was employed in the case,—he found he was obliged to pay the sum asked by the society, \$2,250, though he had paid some \$700 during the three years in question besides; so that he had to pay nearly \$1,000 for the use of less than \$2,000 for three years. This was one of the grievances which ought to receive the earnest consideration of the House. They also found that our commercial men were borne down in these hard times by the heavy interest they were obliged to pay to carry on their business until times revived; and that our lumber and manufacturing interests were suffering in the same manner, and many men were driven to the wall, and many more would follow. Some scheme might be devised which would stimu-

MR. ORTON.

late our industries, and create greater prosperity in this particular. When they looked at the amount of currency in Canada, and compared it with the amount which was in circulation in other countries, they found that, while in this country there was at the present time something like \$31 per family of currency in circulation, in the United States there was \$88 per family; in France, which had been remarkable for the wonderful rapidity with which she had recovered from her war debt, the circulation was \$200 per family; and, in Great Britain, \$142 per family. He thought that was a matter that ought to receive the earnest and serious consideration of this House and the Government. and, if they had to issue legal tender notes such as were issued by Sir Francis Hincks and which it had been stated saved the country \$400,000, he believed it would be of immense benefit, and would tend to reduce the interest which our various industries were obliged to pay on borrowed money, and at the same time act as a stimulus to our manufacturing and other industries. It took at least one-fifth of the able-bodied population of this country to support the present system, working at a dollar a day to pay the interest upon the mortgages which existed upon property in this country, and by this they could form some idea of the importance of this matter, and how very urgently it was required that some steps should be taken in the direction he had indicated. The cost of Government was a matter that he thought might worthily receive the earnest consideration of this House. Since Confederation the cost of the Government of this country had increased two-fold. He thought that there might be vast improvements and great reforms made in this particular; but the Government of the day seemed to satisfy themselves with having passed an Election Law, and prided themselves that they had carried out what the great Reform party of this country expected and desired. He was greatly mistaken, if, when the general election occurred, they did not find out that the great Reform party of this country had expected better things from the present Government. Where.

he would like to ask, was that great reform so eloquently portrayed for two Sessions by the hon. the Minister of the Interior—the reorganization of the Senate? Where was that reform which was to relieve us from many of the heart-burnings and the sore feelings which existed between the different classes in this country—representation of minorities? Where was the scheme for compulsory voting; where that great and lofty reform by which the British Empire was to be reorganized—all foreshadowed by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake)? Echo answered “Where?” But were there no reforms that could be made in the management of our various Departments? He thought there were. He thought there was not one single Department at the present time in which there might not be made great and substantial reforms, by which the cost of the Government of this country might be very materially reduced, to the great benefit of the people of Canada. But how could they expect that from the present Government? The hon. the Premier had, in picnic speeches, said that in accepting office he had not abandoned the least of the principles he had professed. In a speech at St. Catharines in 1870, he expressed himself as follows:—

“A man who did one thing in Opposition, and another when he was in power, was a demagogue in whom the people could have no confidence whatever; and he was prepared the moment when any Reform Government should come into power, when they were ready to depart from the principles which actuated them in Opposition, to take the same grounds against them that he took against their natural enemies now.”

He (Mr. Orton) would like to ask this House and the country whether the hon. the Premier had fulfilled these high principles, and lofty expressions of political sentiment? He would first ask whether he had maintained that great principle of the Reform party, the importance of preserving intact the Independence of Parliament Act? They had heard very much of the features of this Act in this House; and he thought there were one or two cases which ought to have been brought before the House before now, and that were, at any rate, of as grave, if not of a more grave character,

than those which had already been brought to the notice of the House and the country. He referred, in the first place, to the case of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Bannatyne) whose absence from this House during the present Session was very marked. It was generally understood and known throughout the Province of Manitoba that that hon. gentleman's sympathies were not thoroughly in accord with the present Government, but they found that his name figured in the Public Accounts for a very large sum of money; his vote was always found with the Government. Was it a bought vote or not? The consequence of this carelessness and recklessness on the part of the Government, to say the least, if it were not corruption on the part of the Government, was that the constituency of Provencher was to-day left unrepresented in this House. Had the people of Manitoba no rights to maintain in this House that they could afford to be represented by only three representatives, instead of four? If he was not mistaken, the people of that country would feel that a great wrong had been done them through what he might almost term the criminal conduct of the Government in this respect. It was said that the hon. gentleman had offered a resignation of his seat in this House; but, through the intrigues of members of the Government or their friends, he was induced to withdraw his resignation, because it was felt that to open any constituency in that Province would be very injurious to the interests of this Government. It would be like Digby, N.S., and many other constituencies that had been rendered vacant, where the Government had been unmistakably defeated and condemned at the polls. The hon. the First Minister had said, at a meeting in North Lanark, that he could find no possible reason for a coalition—

“Unless it would be alleged that the leading men of the Reform party are not capable of forming a Government and carrying on the affairs of the country. The cry is raised ‘measures, not men,’ but if good measures are wanted, you must have good men. He for one knew that within the ranks of the Reform party there were men who could form a pure Government without going to the high-

ways and by-ways for so-called Independents and loose fish. He objected to coalitions; first, because they were not necessary, and second, because associations formed on that ground were iniquitous, and had been condemned universally."

He would simply point, in reply to this, to the various changes which had taken place in the Cabinet, as well as to the first formation of the present Cabinet; and what did they find? Did they find that, within the ranks of the Reform party, men had been found capable and able to occupy these high positions as Ministers of the Crown? He thought not; but they found that the following Tories—old, life-long Conservatives—had been taken into the Ministry to form the backbone of the present Cabinet:—Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smith, Mr. Vail, Mr. Burpee, Mr. Coffin, and, lastly, Mr. Jones, and he might also mention the late President of the Council, Mr. Cauchon. Surely, if there was any ground for the reason which the Prime Minister gave in 1870 for objecting to coalitions, that was one, when he said that such associations were iniquitous, and had been condemned universally. Again, they found Mr. Huntington and Mr. Laflamme, whose public reputation was perhaps not of the highest, in consequence of certain transactions which had been brought before this House. The next platform of the Reform party was shown in the speech made by Mr. Mackenzie in London in 1870:—

"While the finances of the Provinces were formerly administered by one Minister, they had now four. He could not see that there was any necessity for such amplification, there was no necessity for a Cabinet of thirteen. The United States had a vast population and a vast territory, still they got along with seven Ministers, and one Secretary of the Treasury conducted all the financial business."

The present Government had forgotten that platform. He thought he had now sufficiently shown that the hon. Premier had not fulfilled the obligations which he undertook to the people of this country when he entered office. He now wished to refer shortly to another paragraph in the Address. It stated:

"That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the

Dominion; and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression, that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away."

This seemed to him like a cruel sarcasm upon one at least of the largest industries of the country; for, if ever a Government were guilty of trying to prevent prosperity in any one class, it was the present Government, who had continuously and persistently refused to do justice to the great agricultural population of this country. It appeared that the Government were looking, as they all looked, to good crops and the prosperity of the farming population of this country as the backbone and mainstay of our country, and the source from which, perhaps, the largest amount of general prosperity would come; but they found that the policy pursued had reduced the profits derived from farming in this country, through the unfair competition of American produce, to such an extent that there were not 100 acres in this country occupied with good farming land upon which from \$50 to \$100 a year more could not be made if we had something like fair relations with our neighbours across the border. Circumstanced as we were, with a long frontier extending from ocean to ocean, where we were brought into direct competition with our neighbours across the border, our farmers felt it more heavily every year. This year they had had a good crop, but he must say that it had been far over-estimated. In his section of the country, for quite a circle round the county of Wellington, where he lived, he was sorry to say they had had bad crops for a number of years, and in his immediate neighbourhood they were even worse than last year. The same state of things existed to some extent in many other parts of the country; but, he was free to confess that, taking the country throughout, they had had a fair average crop. But they found, in his county, American oats coming in at 28c. and 30c. a bushel, reducing the price of Canadian oats. In the village in which he lived, one miller alone had imported from the United States 60,000 bushels of American

MR. ORTON.

oats. Another miller, in the same place, had imported a larger amount. He wished to show, in a more marked way, how the trade in farm products between this country and the United States existed at the present day, compared with what it was ten years ago. In 1868, or during reciprocity, and before that period, they exported large quantities of farm products of every description to the United States, both cereals and animals. But what did they find now? That, since 1868, the amount of those products for which they could get a market in the United States had year after year been decreasing, while the American farmer had year after year obtained an increasing market in this country. In 1868, there were only some forty horses imported from the United States into Canada; in 1875 there were no less than 1,225, or thirty times as many horses brought from the United States into Canada. In 1868 they only imported four horned cattle into this Dominion from the United States; in 1875 they imported not less than 4,580, or a thousand times as many cattle. In 1868 there were only seven live hogs brought into the country; while in 1875 there were 28,256, or four thousand times as many. In 1868 they imported 55 sheep; in 1875 they imported 8,690. In 1868, they imported 40,450cwt. of meat-stuffs, whereas in 1875 they imported 195,874cwt., or five times as much cured meats in 1875 as was imported in 1868. He might also point out that there was a very large market obtained in this country for flour and meal by the Americans. The American millers sold for consumption in this country no less than \$3,034,683 worth of flour and meal, only \$38,000 worth of which was re-exported. There were also over six million bushels of wheat imported in the same year, three millions of which were re-exported, leaving \$3,200,000 worth of wheat to be consumed in this country. The farmers of this country had found, especially, that the price of their hogs had been terribly decreased through the importation of live hogs into this country, brought into direct competition with the pork of our farmers in our own markets. The Government were also

chargeable with still further decreasing the profits of the agricultural population of this country by the imposition of the duty on malt. It was well known that this country was highly adapted for the growth of barley. A large quantity of barley was every year grown in Canada; but, owing to the imposition of this increased duty, which amounted to 72c. per bushel, or 25 per cent. more than the price they obtained for barley, there had been a great decrease in the consumption of barley in Canada for malting and brewing purposes. A serious injury and wrong had been done to the farmers through this tax. It was stated by the hon. the Minister of Justice a few nights ago that, if this side of the House could show him how prosperity could be restored, or even the depression retarded, he would gladly give the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) his place and lend him his assistance. He thought that, if the Government would put forth some endeavour to reform in this direction which he had pointed out, the widespread depression which existed in Canada would be greatly decreased, and their prosperity again brought back to them. It seemed the Government were putting their old trust in something that was intangible. They said they "trusted that this commercial depression was passing away." Were they trusting to a Russian war, or some other adventitious circumstance, instead of endeavouring to do what lay in their power to restore prosperity? He could not agree with the statement that the improvement in the revenue returns was a sure indication of returning prosperity. As was stated by the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) on the previous evening, it was a well-known fact that the wholesale merchants in this country imported very largely this year, expecting that there would be an immense sale for their goods in consequence of the good harvest which the newspapers had stated existed in this country. But, in every town and village in this country, large quantities of goods were remaining on the shelves of the merchants unsold, and they also found that the wholesale men had been unable to dispose of anything like the

whole of their goods; the result of which would be, he feared, instead of an increase of their prosperity, a continuation of the failures which had occurred throughout this country, and he thought the increased revenue was from this source, and, therefore, could not be a certain indication of returning prosperity. It might also be that, in consequence of the policy that had been pursued, many of their manufactures having been driven out of the country had caused an importation of foreign manufactured goods, and thereby increased the revenue, but at a very serious cost to the people of this country—at a cost of a large part of their population and a large part of their wealth. It had been stated also by the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the manufacturing prosperity of the United States was not as great as the manufacturing prosperity of this country. All he could say was that the exportation of manufactured goods from the United States had, year after year, increased; their trade abroad had increased to a wonderful extent. He would read to the House what Consul Shaw had stated in reference to the trade of this country and the United States:—

“The United States Consul at Toronto has forwarded to the Department of State a report of the commerce of the Province of Ontario with the United States. The Consul says that as far as trade and commerce are concerned, Ontario is the same as one of the States of the Union. He reports a large and continually increasing trade in American manufactures, their superiority in style and finish having completely obliterated old prejudices against them. At present the feelings of the people, politically and commercially, are thoroughly American. The Consul thinks that for the future Ontario will rely upon the United States for all her manufactures, as it would now be impossible to start any manufactories there which could hope to compete with those of the United States, and no foreign manufactures can. The imports into Ontario during the year 1875 (the last official reports published) amounted to over \$42,000,000. Of this amount over \$26,000,000 were from the United States, against \$15,000,000 from Great Britain. The exports during the same year from the forty-six ports of the Province amounted to a little over \$18,000,000, more than \$8,000,000 less than the imports from the United States alone. The failures in all Canada during the last two

MR. ORTON.

years are represented as amounting to more than \$50,000,000, but, on account of the American system of cash sales, it is thought that \$600,000 of this total will cover American losses. A perseverance in this cash system, having all goods equal to representation, together with caution not to overstock the markets by pushing sales, and the future trade of the United States with Ontario will be both large and profitable.”

He would also, in order to show how the cotton manufactures of the United States had increased, read a statement from an American paper:—

“Since 1875 our annual exports of cotton manufactures have run up from \$4,071,882 to \$10,235,843. American piece goods are now sold in every town in England at a lower price and of a superior quality to English goods of a corresponding grade.”

He might go on to show how the manufacturers of the United States were increasing in prosperity, and enlarging their markets, while our home market was being continually reduced by the unfair competition of American manufacturers; but he would not detain the House longer. He would conclude by expressing the hope that, notwithstanding the meagre character of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, wiser and more patriotic counsels would yet prevail in our Government, and would lead to some measure of endeavour, at least, on their part to do their duty to the people of this country during the present Session. He hoped the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) would not plead in vain for protection for the manufacture of beet-root sugar, an industry which he (Mr. Orton) believed could be developed successfully in this country, and which he thought should receive the serious consideration of this Government and of this House.

MR. POULIOT said that, although the discussion had already been very long and acrimonious, he could not let it terminate without replying to some of the observations of hon. gentlemen opposite,—Conservatives from the Province of Quebec. These hon. gentlemen, not content with endeavouring to make the country believe that to them all the merit of the excellent measures which the then Opposition had forced them to adopt, when they were in power, was due, also

wished to impress on the country the belief that to them was due the merit of the excellent measures adopted under the present régime, and that the Liberals not only had no right to any praise for the good they did, but, further, were responsible for the evil which those hon. gentlemen themselves had committed. He had certainly been far from expecting that these hon. gentlemen would again attempt, at this date, to excite the minds of the people with regard to a question that the present Government had settled several years since; but he had forgotten that we were on the eve of a general election, and that these hon. gentlemen still believed, without doubt, that they could obtain some advantage by reviving this question—he now alluded to the North-West troubles—in which the unfortunate Riel and his companions were concerned. To listen to these hon. gentlemen one would believe that they alone laboured to secure the settlement of that matter, and, addressing the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, they said: "If you had joined us, we would have obtained a full and complete amnesty." He was ready to believe that these hon. gentlemen were sincere, and that they really wished to secure such an amnesty; but really, considering how they had acted, and what they said to the Liberals to-day, one was persuaded to think that they had not desired an amnesty, or that, well aware that they could not obtain it, they wished to profit by this circumstance to embarrass the Government and overthrow it, if possible. He purposed showing, with the papers in his hand, that if these hon. gentlemen had been sincere, they would have, in effect, secured an amnesty, in the first place, by means of their friends, when these were in power, by exercising their influence on Sir George Cartier, since they were in office more than two years after the North-West troubles took place. Let them see what was done when this question was brought before the House. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) could tell them something about it, as he (Mr. Masson) was one of the members appointed to look into the matter. It was not forgotten, doubtless, that the

Government had promised to grant an amnesty if it was established that this had been promised. It was also known—and the report of the Committee was before them showing it—that his Grace Archbishop Taché and the Rev. Father Ritchot had stated before the Committee, that the amnesty had been promised them by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Cartier and Sir Clinton Murdoch; and further,—and this would be seen on consulting the report—how the hon. members for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) and Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had testified before the Committee. Why, then, had not the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec aided the right hon. member for Kingston to refresh his memory, and reminded him of what had taken place? If they had acted in this manner, the House would not have witnessed so much forgetfulness in this regard, on each occasion when their leader was questioned as to what had passed between Mgr. Taché, Father Ritchot and himself. Why, also, when the Rev. Father Ritchot said that the amnesty was promised him by Sir Clinton Murdoch, in presence of Lord Lisgar and of the hon. member for Charlevoix, had not this hon. gentleman stated openly what was then done? But, no; the hon. gentleman took advantage of his position as Minister of the Crown to decline to reply. It seemed to him that, under these circumstances, it was not for the hon. member to refuse to answer, but he ought to have waited until objection was taken to his testimony by one of the parties interested, according to the practice of our Courts before doing so. Besides, he (Mr. Pouliot) maintained that the hon. member was not then present in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown, but in the position of an ordinary witness, and that he should have answered and informed the Committee whether or no an amnesty had, at that time, been pledged to the Rev. Father Ritchot. He consequently affirmed that, if the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec had then sincerely wished to obtain an amnesty, they would have induced their friends the hon. members for Kingston and Charlevoix to answer before the Com-

mittee otherwise than they had done, and an amnesty would have been granted. But this was not all; let them see what followed. The long discussion which took place on the motion of the hon. the Premier, in favour of an amnesty such as was granted, would be remembered without doubt—and also the active part that the right hon. member for Kingston had taken in it. It was further known that to this motion the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) proposed an amendment, demanding a full and complete amnesty. What number of votes were cast in favour of this amendment? It was only twenty-three. Even the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec were not united on this point; for, in addition to the French-Canadian Conservatives, he (Mr. Pouliot) found among that number only two English-speaking Conservatives from Quebec, (Mr. Macdougall and Mr. Wright of Ottawa) besides the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster). He looked in vain on this list for the name of the right hon. member for Kingston, who had taken so leading a part in the debate. That right hon. gentleman's name was not included in the division either for the affirmative or for the negative. Where, then, was the hon. gentleman? It pained him to say, with regard to an hon. gentleman of his position, that, when the division bell sounded on that occasion in connection with a matter of this importance, the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) in place of remaining in his seat to perform his duty, precipitately left the House. And this was not all,—the vote was immediately afterwards taken on the principal motion, and then the name of this right hon. gentleman was found in the front rank among those who did not wish any amnesty whatever to be granted; and, more surprising still, they saw the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec, who were fully satisfied with the conduct of the hon. gentleman, accuse the Liberals of that Province with being responsible for the fact that a complete amnesty had not been granted. He, in view of these circumstances, would ask the House and the country—supposing for a moment that they, the Liberals, had acted regarding this matter as their friends

the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec had desired—what would they have obtained? The Liberals had done all that it was possible for them to do under the circumstances, and, for his part, he could say with certainty that he had been in some measure instrumental in securing the settlement of this question in the manner in which it was settled, and that nothing he had done in his parliamentary career had given him as great pleasure as this fact. Further, what followed was a proof of the wisdom of this settlement, as peace had since reigned in the country; and this fact not only delighted himself but also the country and Riel himself, since Riel could in a short time return to live in peace among his countrymen. He would pass on to another question. The Conservative members from the Province of Quebec had also brought before the House a matter which should certainly not be discussed, either there or elsewhere by the laity; but, since these hon. gentlemen had mentioned it, he could not refrain from saying a few words in this connection. Once again, he would repeat that these hon. gentlemen, not satisfied with appropriating to their own account the good which the Liberals had accomplished, wished to impute to the latter the evil which they themselves had done in this relation. Really, it was somewhat extraordinary—and all the Province of Quebec would be greatly surprised when it saw—that these hon. gentlemen, forbidden any longer to drag religion into politics, and ordered to put an end to abuses, the existence of which they themselves admitted, in view of what they had just said, desired to create the impression that it was not they but rather the Liberals who had thus begun to introduce religion into political discussions, and to take advantage of this circumstance. This was the way in which these hon. gentlemen wished to falsify history, and this pretension he could not allow to pass in silence. In fine, it was an evil to mingle religion and politics together. Why had not the Conservatives, the born guardians of all good principles, protested in the press and elsewhere against this abuse? Why, during all these years that religious matters had thus been

MR. POULIOT.

discussed in the press, as well as in public meetings and everywhere else, had not the Conservatives appealed to Rome where such matters should be decided? Would they to-day deny that it was the Liberals, with a certain number of good Conservatives, he would admit, and a considerable proportion of the clergy, who had appealed to Rome in this regard? For it was not to be believed that the Conservatives were supported by all the clergy as they would have it believed; on the contrary, the Liberals had on their side a large number of priests, and those two rev. gentlemen, who were among the most distinguished, the most influential, and the most able of their order; and these gentlemen, justly alarmed, owing to what was passing in their midst among the Catholics, had with one accord appealed to Rome, where, as it was known, the Conservatives were represented by ecclesiastics of great ability, and where, as was also known, all the politico-religious questions which divided them, were discussed so lengthily and ably that Rome, after having heard the pros and cons, did not think it proper to come at once to a decision, but sent out to Canada that eminent personage whom they all knew, Mgr. Conroy, who, after having collected the requisite information, had informed them through the proper channel that, with reference to religion, the two parties that existed in Canada, Liberal as well as Conservative, were not condemned the one more than the other, and that each elector could vote for the candidate of either party as his conscience dictated to him. It would be thus he (Mr. Pouliot) hoped in the future, for, as a Roman Catholic, he was happy to see and to say in this Chamber that the faith of their fathers was still so firmly established in Canada, that all, whoever they might be, or to whatever party they might belong, Rome having spoken, submitted, without distinction of persons. He dared hope, then, that, in future, the Conservatives would leave to those who were specially charged with these matters, the supervision of religious questions, and that they would no longer be seen to introduce them in the press, in public

meetings or elsewhere. It seemed to him that there were enough of other questions of public interest that they could discuss, above all in the Province of Quebec, and they would do better to endeavour to come to a mutual understanding than to create divisions among themselves. He could not but disapprove of the expressions which the hon. member for Lévis had made use of, that afternoon, and to which hon. gentlemen opposite had not failed to give the most unfavourable meaning possible. He did not think that the hon. member had desired to impart to his words the meaning which hon. gentlemen opposite did; but, in any case, he could not but regret that the hon. gentleman had used such expressions, and disapprove of them. He also regretted the manner in which the debate had been carried on during the past few days. In place of discussing the Address, hon. gentlemen had taken up almost all their time in handling offensive personalities. Really, when the people saw what was passing in the House, they would ask if the members came there for such a purpose, or to busy themselves with the public business of the country. He, consequently, trusted that hon. gentlemen would abandon this mode of debate and introduce a little more *decorum* in the discussions. Like other gentlemen who had preceded him, he perceived that he had hardly as yet referred to the Address; and he did not wish to take his seat without saying a few words about it. He observed that one paragraph treated of the fertility of the North-West Territories, and alluded to what ought to be done to facilitate the settlement of those regions. Hon. gentlemen opposite had at once seized the opportunity of saying that, in consequence of this fact, it was wrong to censure the conduct of Sir George Cartier when he purchased that country. He (Mr. Pouliot) believed that public opinion had not changed on this point, at least in the Province of Quebec. They had never denied that these territories were fertile; but what they had condemned was the enormous sum that was paid by the Dominion, and which we ought not to have paid for them, and the fact

that these things had been done much more rapidly than should have been the case. For his part, he regretted that the present Government followed a little too closely the steps taken in this regard by the late Administration, thus expending too much on those Provinces and not enough on the old Provinces. He considered that a little too much attention was paid to the North-West Territories by the Government, to whatever party it belonged, and he dared hope that their hon. friends the Ministers from the Province of Quebec, above all, would remind their colleagues, and the hon. the First Minister particularly, in his capacity of Minister of Public Works, that there were still some desirable strips of territory in the east, and that they would, from time to time, draw his attention to them, and especially to the eldest daughter of the family, whom they seemed to wish to neglect some what, causing him particularly to see that, if there were fertile lands in the North-West, there were also very fertile lands in their Province, where at least, a million of souls could be settled, and that in consequence of the financial condition of that Province (Quebec) there was still more need, in this regard, of some aid from the Federal Government.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he desired to make an explanation to the House with regard to certain expressions of which he had made use that afternoon, and which had been interpreted in a sense which he had not intended to convey. He had not purposed formally declaring that the decoration that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) possessed had been purchased by the hon. gentleman at Rome; but he had wished to say that it had been secured through many sacrifices, and many *démarches*, and many solicitations, perhaps, on the part of the hon. gentleman. He hoped that this explanation would be satisfactory to the House, and that hon. members would not give any other meaning to the expressions in question than that which would be agreeable with this explanation. He had spoken previously in English, and he was unable to express his thoughts in that language with the same facility that he could in

MR. POULIOT.

French. He trusted that this explanation would be accepted in the same way that he would accept any such explanation on the part of any other hon. member.

Mr. COCKBURN said he apprehended that the Speech from the Throne would be generally acceptable to the people of Canada. He was very much pleased to find that the Government had finished the instrumental surveys of the whole line of the Pacific Railway, and he thought it important that at least some four or five sections of the road should be proceeded with as soon as possible, and particularly the portion which was formerly known as the Georgian Bay Branch. A large number of people in the northern part of Ontario, and also, he believed, in Quebec, were looking forward anxiously to the construction of this section, and he hoped that no further delays would occur. He regretted the fact that so many unexpected delays had taken place in the past; but he believed these were due to causes over which the Government had no control. He could not refrain from alluding to some remarks which had fallen from the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) while filling his favourite rôle of slanderer the other evening.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. COCKBURN said he hurled back the insinuations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) in regard to his constituency, which, however, had suffered from the corruptions and manipulations of the late Government. It was untrue that the Ontario Government had taken any part whatever in securing his return; and, in defence of both Conservatives and Reformers in his constituency, he hurled back the statements made by the hon. member (Mr. Bowell). He would not recount the incidents attending the election in 1872, but he had all the papers; and, if he gave a narrative of these events, it would not be at all flattering to the hon. gentlemen opposite. Reference had been made to a letter of introduction to himself, given by a member of the Local Parliament of Ontario to a certain person; but this was nothing extraordinary, as a great many people

who came up into that part of the country brought introductions to him, scores of which, moreover, were never delivered for want of opportunity. A few unscrupulous opponents of his had, in 1872, not only stolen his letters, but also a poll-book. The right hon. member for Kingston had then pursued a most ridiculous policy regarding the choice of returning officers; and he (Mr. Cockburn) was to have been denied his seat, although he had clearly obtained the majority at the election; and he was under great obligations to the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) for the way in which he had forced the then Government to do him justice. If he gave the details in this connection, they would not redound much to the credit of the leaders of the Opposition. The Ontario Government had not interfered in his favour, and he affirmed, without fear of contradiction, that no member of the House had been more freely chosen than himself. He would not allow officials in the employ of the Ontario Government, nor even his own employés, to interfere in his behalf if they so felt inclined. He was sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) and the *Mail* were incorrect in saying that the party to whom allusion had been made had received some \$2,000 or \$3,000 from the Ontario Government for services rendered in 1872. Mr. Card was a stranger to him, and had never interfered in his election. He would not allow this for a moment, on the part of Mr. Card, or of Government officials. The whole amount which Mr. Card had received for repairing roads and paying hands, and for his services, he was confident, had not exceeded \$1,000. An employé of the Ontario Government had interfered in his election in 1874, but it had been on behalf of his opponent. In 1874, on the day of nomination, he had gone to his opponent and said to him: "Now, let us carry out this election as elections should be conducted; give me your hand that you will spend no money save for travelling expenses." His opponent had agreed, and, in his belief, had carried out the agreement faithfully, though that gentleman's business partner, without his consent, had spent \$600 or \$700. [His own

expenses had not been \$200. No Government officials had interfered in his election, although some unscrupulous individuals belonging to the other side had once carried matters with a very high hand in his constituency; but he was very glad to say both Conservatives and Reformers, setting their forces against these individuals, had driven them out. Peace, contentment, and fair play now prevailed in his constituency. He was neither able nor willing to spend money in his elections, and he did not wish anybody else to do so; and he was bound to say that the same thing was true regarding the Conservatives in his constituency. They acted fairly and squarely in connection with these matters.

Mr. ROY said that, as a Canadian, as a Catholic and as a member of the House, he was one of those who regretted the unfortunate words which had fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette). He was willing to admit that the hon. member for Lévis had not meant all that his words implied, but, on the other hand, there was much to be said in support of what the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blanchet) had stated. The language used by the hon. member (Mr. Fréchette) had not redounded to the credit of the French-Canadian nationality. He had raised the religious question. A newspaper extract had been mentioned, the truth of which his hon. friend would not guarantee, in reference to Mr. Thibault, and his action was said to have been intended to assure the success of the Conservative candidate. These accusations were either true or false. They were either altogether true or altogether false. There were two perfectly distinct parts in the quotation given to the House by the hon. member for Lévis. If this report was true, he protested energetically against the conduct of Mr. Thibault; and, on the other hand, if the facts referred to in the said report were true, the hon. member for Lévis had no right to take his seat in the House. It was well known to all that the hon. member for Lévis had been traduced in this extract as a thief, etc.; and there was not a member of the House who did not believe that

these things were not true; but, if they admitted that the last part of the report, referring to religious questions, was true, what were they to say regarding the truth of the first portion referring to the hon. member for Lévis. They knew perfectly well that Christian charity did not oblige people to be merciful to those gentlemen who might act as Mr. Thibault was said to have acted; and, if the hon. member for Lévis had been treated in the course of the election in Digby as he described, why had he not taken the matter before the Courts and brought out the truth. It was because the hon. member himself considered the report to be a falsehood which must be rejected altogether. Another consideration evolved out of the arguments of the hon. gentleman, was that, as a Canadian and a Catholic, supposing this report were true, it did not reflect honour upon the hon. gentleman to throw discredit upon the Catholic Acadian population of Nova Scotia. Was it possible that, in a country, civilized, and with a population educated like our own, any person could be brought to believe that any man, speaking on the hustings at the doors of the churches, was an emissary of the Pope and a new apostle? This was utterly absurd from the beginning to the end. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fréchette), with the oratorical talent that distinguished him in the course of his harangue, had taken the opportunity of calling the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) the high priest of the Conservative party; but he (Mr. Roy) was persuaded that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langevin) would attribute this remark to the same thoughtlessness as had characterized other statements of the hon. gentleman on that occasion. If the hon. member had better understood his duties as a French-Canadian, he would not have been the first to cast irony upon a countryman worthy of a high consideration among all his fellow-citizens, and more especially with regard to a badge of honour which every Catholic should be proud to receive. The hon. member for Lévis, alluding to the speeches delivered by the hon. members for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), had challenged them, saying

Mr. Roy.

they would not dare to publish in their own party papers the speeches delivered by them on the floor of this House; but he (Mr. Roy), not only differed from the hon. member for Lévis on that ground, but would add that, notwithstanding their readiness to accept such a challenge, should there be a proposal to the effect that neither these gentlemen's speeches nor that of the hon. member for Lévis be inserted in the public records, he (Mr. Fréchette) would joyfully grasp at such a proposal, so as to have a chance for himself to remove from these records the unhappy speech he had himself just delivered before the House, and moreover, perhaps, he would offer compensation.

MR. BLANCHET: Yes, and one heavier still than the cost of the badge.

MR. ROY said he also believed it. He alluded to the length of time spent in discussing the principles of the Opposition, but he was at a loss to know why this discussion had not been brought on the principles—if any there were—advocated by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; for these were the principles which should have been made known by them, to show to what extent they were, or might be, entitled to the public confidence at the next general election. Hon. gentlemen had sneered at small majorities, and he (Mr. Roy) was made to believe that the Government expected a courteous return from counties in which these small majorities were given. He stated his majority to have been 54, but he was perfectly satisfied that, under the circumstances in which the last election had taken place in his own county, this majority was to be considered as a serious one. The religious question had been brought forward; but he could safely appeal to the gentlemen who were acquainted with the facts as to whether, when he had the honour of asking for the support of the electors in the county of Kamouraska, he had ever introduced other than purely political issues. The religious question had not been introduced in any way into the contest. He would say in the House what he had stated everywhere.

in the county of Kamouraska, when he had met the Hon. Senator Pelletier in the county. He was well acquainted with the personal merits of the Hon. Senator Pelletier as a citizen and a Catholic, and that gentleman had not lost the confidence of the electors of the county of Kamouraska because he was less a Catholic or a Christian than himself (Mr. Roy), but purely because he was a member of a Government in which those electors had no confidence. This was the reason why the Hon. Mr. Pelletier had been beaten in that contest; and this was the reason why he (Mr. Roy) had then obtained the relatively considerable majority of 54 votes in the county of Kamouraska and this majority, under the present state of things, could not, for that reason, be displaced. The House should mark this well, for he spoke with confidence on this subject. Since 1851, from which date took place the great political struggle in the county of Kamouraska, he was the only one who had obtained so large a majority as 54 in the Conservative interest. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who had made a brilliant speech on which he felicitated him, had referred to the intervention of the religious question in politics; but the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that this question had not been introduced into the contest in any parish of the county of Temiscouata. The hon. gentleman had also spoken of the amnesty question, and, from his statements, it appeared that, if they had secured an amnesty for their friends in Manitoba, it was due to the hon. the Premier. This matter had been discussed at such length that he would say little about it; but the hon. gentleman should not forget the declaration of the hon. the First Minister that, if he granted an amnesty, it was only on account of the *pourparlers* that had taken place in this connection between their friends in Manitoba and the members of the late Administration. This was the real state of the case. In fact it might be said that otherwise the Government would have positively refused to grant that concession.

Mr. ROBINSON said that, in common with the great majority of the

members of the House, and he believed of the people of this country, he viewed with surprise the statement contained in the first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, which declared that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country required their attendance. How could this be in view of the fact that our manufacturers were complaining that foreigners had possession of their markets, and also of the fact that, under the present system, the wages of our artizans of almost every grade were kept down and their comforts diminished? In order to draw hon. gentlemen from the right track, the hon. member for North Norfolk had been put up to second the Address, and had told them that the Americans, under their system of protection, were suffering more than the people of any other country from commercial depression. He would ask, if this was true, how it was that the Americans were now paying the interest accruing on their enormous debt, besides having paid off four or five hundred millions of the principal during the last few years? How was it, if the Americans were suffering so much as was represented, that their exports exceeded by 151 millions of dollars their imports. He would ask the hon. gentleman further, considering the supposed suffering of the Americans, and taking the state of trade between the greatest commercial country in Europe and the United States, how it was that, while ten years ago the balance of trade was \$37,000,000 in favour of England, it was now, after the lapse of a few years, under the protection system, \$275,000,000 in favour of the Americans? Why, if the Americans were suffering so much and protection was such an evil to the country, was it that American calicos were seen every day upon the counters of Manchester firms, and in other towns surrounding Manchester? How was it that, in that old town of steel renown, Sheffield, the steel of Pennsylvania and of Pittsburg was rivalling that of the old town itself? How was it that, under this system of protection, in the old city of Coventry, the watch-trade had been eclipsed by American watches? How was it that America,

and not Europe, to-day ruled the price of the leather trade of the world? How was it that hundreds of thousands of rifles and other vast war material were now being furnished from Rhode Island instead of Birmingham? They were told by a gentleman who occupied the position of Superintendent of Statistics in the United States, and who ought to know, that in the ten years ending in 1860, the tariff of the United States was not a free-trade tariff, as described by the hon. member for North Norfolk; but that it was a tariff which gave twenty-five per cent. average of a protection duty; and, further, that, in the ten years ending in 1870, under an extremely high tariff, the ratio of increase had exceeded that of any ten years in the history of the United States, and had exhibited a manufacturing and commercial success such as had seldom been known in any country before. While hon. gentlemen like his hon. friend from North Norfolk and the members of the Cobden Club in England had been spinning their theories, the people of the United States had been steadily reducing the great volume of their foreign imports, so that in the fiscal year ending June last there was a balance in favour of exports of \$151,000,000. They had not only built up this vast foreign commerce which had alarmed free-trade England, but, step by step, they were absorbing and supplying almost the whole of their own home market of 45,000,000 of people who, up to a few years ago, in most of their great staples of trade, were supplied by other countries, chiefly by England. And not only had the United States people increased their exports to this vast extent and taken possession of their own home market, but they were now, under their protective system, boldly and successfully competing with other nations in the leading markets of the world. As one fact to show that protection benefited a country, he mentioned that Sanderson & Sons, one of the oldest and richest manufacturers of Sheffield, had transferred a branch of their business to Syracuse in the United States, supplying it with a capital contributed, they were told, from Sheffield itself.

MR. ROBINSON.

Mr. Ruskin, a gentleman well-known in England, had lately declared that the time had come when the cliffs of Dover should no longer be kept a free counter for goods brought from other countries. We were here, with a long stretch of frontier, and the time had come when the people of this country should consider whether the north bank of the St. Lawrence should any longer be used as a counter for the people of the United States to place their goods upon, to the detriment of our own manufacturers, and without contributing anything to the support of the people or Government of this country. Another fact, to show what Protection did in the United States, was that, in the six great leading protected industries there, namely: woollen and worsted, cotton, paper, glass, iron and steel, there was invested an amount of capital equal to something like \$400,000,000; these four hundred millions of dollars, according to reliable statistics, producing an annual return of something like eight hundred millions of dollars. They could easily fancy the vast amount of good which the distribution of so much annual wealth must be to the country. Then, again, he believed it was a fact that, in the six great manufacturing States of the Union, as they were called—such as Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—the riches accumulated by the people of these States were greatly in excess of the wealth accumulated by the other States of America. In twenty years' experience the result had been that the savings of the people in the banks of these six States, where manufactures were carried on, amounted to something like \$1,400,000,000, whereas the savings of the people in the thirty-one other States, including the nine Territories, only amounted to \$600,000,000. That was a fact to which he would also call the attention of the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he accused them of being ignorant of the fact that the United States of America was suffering at the present moment more than any other great commercial country, under the system adopted by them, and that Protection was of little use to any

state or country. He would also state, as an incentive to Canadians, that these six manufacturing States employed the labour of nearly two and a half millions of people directly, and of nearly double that number, or five millions, indirectly. He defied the hon. gentleman, with all his knowledge of statistics, to impugn these statements. There was this also in Protection, which the history of the United States, during the last ten years, showed—that, notwithstanding their high protective tariff, the consumers in that country got most of their goods at a cheaper rate than the people of Canada did, while at the same time they kept their money in their own country. His hon. friend could not deny that they paid more in Canada for some of these goods under their comparative Free-trade, while in paying for these commodities they sent their money abroad. That was just the difference; and, by encouraging manufactures, employing their people and keeping their money at home, the United States had paid the interest on their vast accumulation of debt, notwithstanding they had among themselves, during these last ten years, a war so great as to be without precedent in the history of the world.

Mr. MILLS: Does the hon. gentleman say that we pay more in Canada than they do in the United States?

Mr. ROBINSON: We do pay more for some goods.

Mr. MILLS: Then Canada is not a slaughter market.

Mr. ROBINSON said we paid more for a certain class of goods, but the hon. gentleman must recollect that we paid our money to foreigners, while the United States kept their money at home. The statistics of iron, notwithstanding the bankruptcy of the United States, as alleged by the hon. member, showed that the product of iron during the past year was double the amount it was in any year previous to the war, while the production of iron for the last year in the old country, had become so diminished that it had created some alarm, and they were inquiring there how it was that the United States, under their pro-

tective system, had produced so large a quantity of iron and steel, as cheaply as produced in England, while under their Free-trade system they found not only that their market in foreign goods was growing less, but that they were being greatly interfered with at home. How was it, if Free-trade was such a popular doctrine, that it was now boldly impeached in the old country? How was it that it was necessary now for the statesmen of the old country, one after another, to repeat—which they did not do some three or four years ago—that there was, after all, something very valuable in this system of Free-trade? The workmen there had begun to see differently, and great discontent was spreading among the working classes in the old country. In a speech made the other day by Lord Hartington, the Liberal leader, he was forced to declare that the workmen of the old country were not in favour of this freedom of commerce, as it was called, and their numbers were beginning to make them formidable. If this statement were true, and if, while America was gaining in her commerce, old England was getting behindhand, the hon. gentleman should do something else besides taunting the Opposition side of the House with being ignorant of facts of which it might, with greater truth, be said that he himself was ignorant. As against this steady development of policy in the United States which had done so much for that country, what had they in Canada to show? Nothing, except an obstinate adherence to a policy here which had already destroyed their tea trade and their sugar trade, and which was ruinous to other trades, and which had thrown out of employment some 400 people in Montreal, who were at work in a refinery there. These were facts which the working people in this country were now beginning to consider. They saw that, not only their present, but their future support depended upon the policy which the Government of this country might adopt in reference to the principle of Protection or Free-trade. He knew it was said by some of the friends of the present Ministry that they had made this a very cheap country to live in. It might be so;

no one could deny the fact that it was so cheap that the workingmen could not now get an honest day's wages for an honest day's work. While this lasted, there was little use talking about the cheapness of commodities. How was it that hundreds—he should not exaggerate if he said thousands—of our artizans were now employed in factories in the United States, and supporting that Government, when, if justice were done to them, they would be here in support of our factories and our Government? A good deal had been said touching the position of the hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Jones), and a correspondence had been exhibited which would strike the people of this country with astonishment. The militia of our country were a bold, high-spirited and sensitive people; and he believed they would resent the attitude of the present Minister of Militia, on the occasion referred to. He would not have adverted to it had the hon. the Minister expressed the slightest regret for the language he had used. He believed that at many a fireside of militiamen in this country, for months and years to come, that language of the gentleman who was at present at the head of the militia, would be quoted only to be condemned. They all knew the regard which not only the militia, but the people of this country had for that flag about which the hon. the Minister had so flippantly talked. The history of this country taught him that, in trying times, the militia breathed the breath of true liberty into the people of this country, and by their gallant conduct, had inspired the rest of the community with a spirit which, thank God, still existed; and in proportion to the affection and devotion with which they regarded that flag, a stain upon which they would resent as a wound, would be the distrust and suspicion with which they would regard the Ministry who had appointed the gentleman who now held the high post of Minister of Militia. Coming from Ontario, he (Mr. Robinson) also regarded with suspicion the language which the Minister of Militia had used touching the trade of Ontario; particularly when he said that if the people of Nova Scotia required any

protection, they required it from the people and commerce of Ontario. If this language represented the true spirit of Nova Scotia, why had they agreed to Confederation, or what was the benefit to be acquired from it? He hoped that the hon. gentleman had also used this language in a time of excitement, and would yet regret it. Did he believe that it would be better for Nova Scotia to deal with the United States than to try and encourage a commerce between the two Provinces? There was little doubt that, with good laws, such as prevailed in other States united together, and such as ought to prevail in this country, the flour and provisions of Ontario would be taken down to supply the wants of the people of Nova Scotia; who, in return, would furnish us with their coal and give steady employment to the 5,000 men now in their coal mines, and to that capital which was now lying stagnant. Something had been said touching the result of the late elections which had been held not only in Ontario, but in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and, although they had been called together for no other purpose than to discuss the ordinary affairs of the country, the people had, during the recess, taken the liberty of discussing the misdeeds of the Ministry in a way not to be mistaken, by electing gentlemen opposed to their policy. There was no free country in which a Ministry, taking possession of power in the triumphant way in which the gentlemen opposite did four years ago, had been rebuffed by the people in the way that they had been. The popular sentiment had so changed that eighteen constituencies had reversed their verdict, and several Ministers had themselves been defeated. The time was coming when members on the Opposition side would have an opportunity of arraigning the policy of the Government before the people. They had to appeal to their constituencies, and ask them whether they approved the shifting and uncertain policy of the Government in the construction of the Pacific Railroad; whether the practices of the gentlemen opposite had been equal to their pretensions at the time they took office. They had to ask the people whether

MR. ROBINSON.

they approved of such transactions as the Lachine Canal affair, the steel rail purchase, the Georgian Bay Railroad and other matters. For himself, he believed that, during the time Sir John A. Macdonald held power, the people of this country were prosperous; that there was then a fair day's wages paid for a fair day's work, but now all this had changed. Their manufactories were being crippled, and their artisans' wages cut down, and their comforts diminished; and he thought the time was coming when the people of this country, when the question was put to them, would decide in favour of the policy pursued by the right hon. gentleman who so ably led the members now in Opposition, and the Liberal-Conservative party in the country; and that they would say the present Government had falsified the principles with which they came into power, and had done a great injustice, not only to the position which they occupied, but to the vital interests of the working men, and to the electors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Fiset said that, in rising to make a few remarks, he had no intention of following the example of several hon. gentlemen who had said the same thing, and nevertheless had spoken for an hour, and even longer. He had been glad to hear the explanations of the hon. member for Levis with regard to what that hon. gentleman had said concerning the hon. member for Charlevoix. If, indeed, those remarks bore the meaning which some hon. members of the Opposition had given them, they could not be approved of, and, as a supporter of the Government, he, in such a case, considered it his duty to disavow all personal responsibility for them. He was far from approving of the manner in which this discussion had been carried on since the commencement of this debate. He believed that the country had little to gain from it; in fact, what had they seen? They had seen hon. members rise and accuse and reproach each other with matters which were almost personal to themselves. And then the religious question had been dragged into the discussion. He did not think that this was the place for it, since both the Conservative and

Liberal press in the Province of Quebec no longer treated of this issue, and no longer connected it with political differences. It seemed to him, that the press of the country in this respect, presented an excellent example; and the gentlemen who had the honour of sitting in the House ought to follow and ought not to debate it there; while, Christians and Catholics as they were, in the Province of Quebec, they ought to submit to the decisions of the clergy in spiritual matters. Hon. gentlemen had also spoken of the Amnesty and New Brunswick School questions, and of Protection. No mention was made of the Amnesty and School questions in the Address; but, nevertheless, it was permitted to hon. gentlemen, in relation to the Address, to introduce any issue whatever in the discussion. He would say one word about the Amnesty question, which had been discussed at great length, during a long time past. He remembered perfectly the circumstances in which they were situated at the time. In agreement with some hon. gentleman who supported the Government, but one of whom had since passed into Opposition, he had steadily laboured to obtain the most favourable possible solution of this question. Perceiving, nevertheless, that it was impossible to secure a complete amnesty, he had been forced to accept a partial amnesty, considering that such an amnesty was better than none at all. Such an amnesty was granted; and, for his part, he believed that all that could have been obtained had been accorded them. The same was true with regard to the school question; and if they had supported, in 1874, the amendment proposed in this regard by the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, it was because this amendment had received the support of a high religious authority; and was it possible to have settled this matter otherwise? He did not think so, though he might be wrong. It was not enough to hurl reproaches at the Government and say that they had not settled these questions as they should have done, but hon. members who made these attacks ought also to indicate the means by which a better solution could have been arrived at. Had these hon.

gentlemen done so? No; they certainly had not. With regard to Protection, he believed that it would come before the House at a later date. The Government was charged with not having taken measures to lessen the effects of the commercial crisis which now effected the country; but he believed that this was unjust. We were suffering less severely from this crisis than England and the United States; and if such a charge was well founded here, was it not well founded in a greater degree with reference to the Imperial Government, for England was in a worse state, in this relation, than was our country, while the same observation was true with regard to the Government of the United States for a similar reason. The members of the National party were accused of inconsistency on this question, because in 1872 they advocated Protection. But he knew that, in the county of *Temiscouata*, and in the county of *Rimouski*, which he represented, this issue had not entered into the contest that year. Nevertheless, the members of this party were said to be inconsistent, and, under the circumstances, they ought to see whether the hon. gentlemen who made these charges were themselves consistent. In 1874, when the Government raised the duties from 15 to 17½ per cent., the members of the Opposition and the Conservative press of Quebec raised the cry that the taxes were being increased, and this was made a cause of censure against the Government; and these gentlemen said that the Government, when in Opposition, had promised to reduce the taxes when they obtained office; while, on the contrary, on this consummation, they had advanced the rate of taxation. This accusation had gone from one end of the Province of Quebec, at least, to the other, and had been circulated by the Conservative press. But now these gentlemen were not satisfied with 17½ per cent., they desired 20 or 25 per cent., and perhaps a higher rate levied, though in 1874, they had blamed the Government for increasing the duties 2½ per cent. These gentlemen who accused the members of the National party of inconsistency, had begun by being inconsistent themselves. He

MR. Fiset.

would not pass in review the different paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, but he would mention one of them that contained information which grieved him; this was that His Excellency Lord Dufferin was about to leave us. Hon. gentlemen more eloquent than himself had stated what a wide and deep feeling of regret would be felt in this country when His Excellency quitted the Dominion, and he knew that in the Province of Quebec, where His Excellency had known how to win for himself the esteem and friendship of all parties and all nationalities, the departure of His Excellency would be generally looked upon almost in the light of a calamity.

MR. BÉCHARD said that hon. gentlemen sitting on both sides of the House had drawn the discussion to a question concerning which, it seemed to him, he should say something. He had not to ascertain whether one party more than the other had solicited the assistance of the clergy in connection with the elections, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House had seemed to repudiate, in the course of the debate, the responsibility of having done such a thing; and, as each placed this responsibility on the shoulders of its opponents, it consequently appeared to him that they had a right to conclude that on this point, at least, both were agreed. This was ground on which they could meet each other, as both parties pretended that they should carry on their political struggles without seeking the intervention of that venerable body, the clergy. He thought they were justified in believing that both sides of the House should regard this question as settled; and he hoped that in the future neither party would merit the reproach of having appealed to the clergy to intervene in the elections. An hon. gentleman, during the discussion, had said that the programme of the Liberal party was the programme which had been laid down by the *Avenir*. Now the *Avenir* was a paper which was published in the city of Montreal twenty-five or thirty years ago, and he considered that to accuse the Liberal party of endorsing that programme was to do this party a great injustice, and to

make a charge which was wanting in sincerity. It was unjust to hold the Liberal party, as it was to-day organized, responsible for writings published twenty-five years ago by a few young and enthusiastic students, and in which philosophical opinions of doubtful orthodoxy were set forth; to do so was to commit an act of injustice, and to pass the limits prescribed by respect for the truth, to as great a degree as it would be to accuse the hon. member for Chateaugay (Hon. Mr. Holton) and Sir Alexander Galt of holding, as their political programme, the Annexationist manifesto which both had signed in 1849. However, he was convinced that there was not an honest man, either in the House or in Canada, who doubted, for an instant, the loyalty of these two gentlemen, and who considered them as being to-day Annexationists. He would say nothing of Amnesty. It had been treated, of at length, and his opinion was that the discussion of it could now lead to no practical result. This matter was now settled, and in his judgment it had been settled not in as satisfactory a measure as they could have desired in the Province of Quebec, but nevertheless in as satisfactory a manner as was possible under the circumstances, when they took into consideration the declaration that had been made by the Minister in charge of the Colonial Department on this subject, in which that gentleman had stated that he would not hear of a complete amnesty being granted. After this declaration, he considered they had a right to believe that the Conservative party, if it had been in power at the time, would not have settled this question in any better way. It was useless to try and raise this issue in connection with the battle that was to be fought at the approaching elections, and he thought it would not be resuscitated. It was painful for him to reply to an insult addressed by an hon. member of the Opposition to the hon. gentlemen representing the Province of Quebec, sitting on his side of the House. He alluded to his hon. friend the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who had gone so far as to treat them as sheep. The hon. gentleman said that upon the hustings

they were lions, but that in the House they were sheep. They had, however, at all events, an advantage over the hon. gentleman; and it was this—the hon. gentleman was not a lion anywhere. He (Mr. Desjardins) had neither the appearance nor carriage of one, and whoever looked at him could not discover the guise of that noble animal. The Government was charged with being responsible for the commercial crisis which prevailed in this country, and he was astonished that the hon. gentlemen opposite did not also hold the Government responsible for the crisis which existed in the United States, England and the rest of the world. This would be clearly absurd, and it was as absurd to say that the Government were responsible for the commercial depression that existed in this country. Great stress was laid on this point; he had heard it repeated on the hustings, and he had no doubt that it would also be repeated at the next election. It was argued that, if we had changed the Government, we would have been prosperous, and that if we changed the Government now, the prosperity of the country would return, and the working classes would have bread again; and when he heard this pretension he could not help being reminded of like declarations made on the part of distinguished demagogues in another country, and which had resulted in the assembling of 200,000 men who erected barricades in the city of Paris, a preliminary step to the overthrow of the throne.

Mr. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said the discussion had travelled over so many diverging paths, that he would not weary the House with any personal allusions, or by going at any length into the Resolution before the House. In fact, he should have said nothing whatever in reference to the Address proposed, had it not been that he could not sit in silence and allow it to go forth to the world that the Address proposed was received with satisfaction on the Pacific coast of the Dominion, although he presumed it mattered little to the other Provinces of the Dominion or to the Ministry what they in British Columbia thought, or what they cared. They had always been

treated with so much contempt, and their wrongs and grievances had been slighted so much, that it made little matter whether they were pleased with the Address or not. Since the accession of the present Ministry to power some four years ago, their Province had suffered under a worse incubus than that to which reference was made in the ninth paragraph, as being sustained by the people of the North-West. British Columbia was visited with a worse incubus than Sitting Bull proved to the poor settlers in the North-West; and while he fully concurred in the hope expressed in that paragraph—that such arrangements would be effected as would lead to a permanent and peaceful settlement of that warlike individual, who smoked his pipe of peace in our dominions so calmly, he also concurred with the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), and hoped that through the results of the next general election the last line of that paragraph with regard to our friend Sitting Bull might also apply to the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, “and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure.” He must regret that the allusions contained in the 10th paragraph of the Address with reference to the survey of the Pacific Railway were not more definite. They were told that these surveys had been made—

“That a complete instrumental survey of the route, by the valleys of the North Thompson and Lower Fraser Rivers, has been made, with a view to ascertain, definitely, whether that route presents more favourable features than the routes already surveyed to Dean Inlet and Bute Inlet respectively; and that it is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable His Excellency's Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea; and that we thank His Excellency for the promise that full information will be laid before us at an early day, of the season's work in this and other directions.”

Now this information should have been given two years ago. From the information which had been placed before them in 1876, they were led to believe that the line would have been located that year, and they were now only informed that when the reports were brought down, they would learn which of the routes would be the most advantageous; but the Government had not told

MR. THOMPSON.

them what they proposed to do when they had ascertained this. The Government gave them no guarantee that any steps would be taken to build the line either by one route or by another. In fact, the people of British Columbia were under the impression—he hoped it was an erroneous one—that the present Government had no intention of building this road at all. He only trusted that the papers, etc., that would be brought down, would show that they were wrong in entertaining this idea. The general belief in British Columbia—and he regretted to say that he agreed in this opinion—was that the Government's only purpose in putting off these surveys from year to year, and in not now laying information before them as to what they intended to do, was simply for the purpose of procrastinating the time until the general elections, and then throwing up their hands and saying that they did not intend to build the railway at all. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn) had that evening congratulated the Government on the result of these surveys, and had expressed the hope that they would begin the work by building the Georgian Bay Branch at once; but the people of British Columbia considered that if the Government commenced to build the line, or any portion of it, work ought to be commenced simultaneously on the completion of the surveys at each end of the road, and that the line starting from the Pacific coast should be commenced at once. They had now waited for this in vain from year to year, and it was only hope deferred again and again. They should, however, know more about it, he supposed, when the concluding portion of the paragraph was carried out, and further information laid before Parliament. In the next paragraph, they were told to accept with thanks His Excellency's congratulations concerning the abundant harvest that had been reaped in all quarters of the Dominion. He only hoped that there was more truth in this than in a great many other statements which had been placed before the House during the present discussion; and that if such was the case, its results would prove permanent. He

thought that hon. gentleman who had congratulated the House and country upon the bountiful harvest that had been reaped, might have travelled in thought across the continent and made some reference to the abundant harvest which it was anticipated would be reaped in another year from the mountains of British Columbia, where last year they had made such discoveries as he believed should, in some measure, attract the attention of the Government. However, the Administration was not much disposed to assist them in British Columbia; they were left to do the best they could to help themselves; and Providence, it was said, assisted those who helped themselves. They looked forward to favourable results in this relation. Members of the Ministry, from the Premier down, had of late travelled through the various cismontane Provinces, attending picnics and political gatherings and blowing their own trumpets; but no Minister of the Crown during that time, he need not remind the House, had ever crossed the continent, or cast his shadow on the waters of the Pacific. The only Minister who ever did so was the Minister of Public Works of the late Government, who visited British Columbia six or seven years ago; and that hon. gentleman had given the results of his mission in a work which, at the time, was widely circulated throughout the country. He thought that if some one of the present Ministers had visited that portion of the Dominion, he would have derived some satisfaction; but, no; these hon. gentlemen and the party by whom they were supported, had, in the first place, opposed the admission of British Columbia into the Union, and ever since they had done their utmost to retard the advancement of that Province; but thanks to the indomitable energy of some of the old pioneers who had first settled in that inhospitable sea of mountains,—as those hon. gentlemen would persist in calling British Columbia,—they had now made such discoveries as to show that they had in their Province, and in their mountains, inhospitable and barren as they might be, such resources of wealth as to prove, in their opinion,

at least—and this they hoped to be able to establish in the course of a year or two, and this was due to their own exertions and not to the assistance of the Ministry—that the District of Cariboo alone would equal, if not excel, any Province in the harvest contributed to the Treasury of the Dominion and the world at large. And to do this, they would trust to nothing, save to their own strong arms and to the energy of their people. They would ask no assistance from the Government, and give the Administration no thanks for anything they had done, because they (the Government) had done nothing to assist the people of their Province when they required a helping hand.

MR. GOUDGE said that the statement of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) required on his part some reference and an answer. Although he had not had the pleasure of being present when the hon. the Minister of Militia delivered the very excellent speech he made to the House, he (Mr. Goudge) had read it in the newspapers. With regard to the flag story, he thought that any reference to it on the part of any hon. member in terms contrary to the spirit of the explanation which had been given by the hon. the Minister of Militia was improper and unbecoming. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had made a full explanation, and he was convinced from the report he had read that this explanation had been perfectly explicit and satisfactory to the House. The hon. gentleman had completely exonerated himself from any charge of disloyalty; and in this connection he (Mr. Goudge) would refer to the fact that a member of the late Government, a gentleman who had since passed away, Sir George E. Cartier, was once a rebel to the Crown, though he afterwards became a member of this House and of the Government, connected with the party that had made the present charges. Hon. gentlemen opposite had referred to the conduct and language of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). In connection with this flag story, he (Mr. Goudge) begged to draw the attention of the House to the strong language used by the late Mr. Howe, during the Confederation troubles, stat-

ing that he and his sons would take up arms in the event of Confederation being forced upon the Province of Nova Scotia; yet it would be found that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all the charges of disloyalty against Mr. Howe, had no hesitation in taking that hon. gentleman into their confidence and asking him to accept positions under the Crown. But the matter did not end there. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), at Halifax, and also in this House, had charged the Minister of Militia with disloyalty. He (Mr. Goudge) desired to draw the attention of the House to the statement made by the hon. member himself while a Minister of the Crown, not in connection with the Dominion Parliament, but in connection with the Government of Nova Scotia, and to the fact that the circumstances under which the statement was made were not those under which the statement was made—if it was made—by the hon. the Minister of Militia. The statement, if made by the hon. the Minister of Militia, was made under very peculiar circumstances. Nova Scotia had, without her consent, been deprived of her Constitution; they applied to the British Crown to have that Constitution returned, but they met with a refusal; and he did not think, even if the statement attributed to the hon. the Minister of Militia had been made, that it could be charged against the hon. member, it having been made in the heat of the moment. Though he (Mr. Goudge) would not yield for a moment to any person in his loyalty to Her Majesty's person or her Crown, yet, at the same time, he could not avoid saying that there might be circumstances with regard to the country of ones birth, and the Constitution under which one might live, such as to lead a man to use such an expression as the hon. the Minister of Militia was alleged to have used, and yet say nothing improper. He would draw attention to the language used by the hon. member for Cumberland at the time he was a member of the Legislature of Nova Scotia; not made under such circumstances as the statement was said to have been made by the hon. the Minister of Militia,

MR. GOUDGE.

but made at a time when there was nothing beyond the ordinary rivalry between constitutional parties, and when the hon. member for Cumberland was anxious to occupy the Treasury benches. The question was whether Mr. Howe should be leader of the Government or the hon. member for Cumberland should occupy this position, and become one of the Ministers of the Crown. In the organ of the party of that day, the *Colonist*, of which the hon. member for Cumberland was said to be editor, or, if not editor, to have completely and entirely inspired its utterances, was found an article, an extract from which he would read. The circumstances were the following:—The Opposition were anxious to occupy the Treasury benches; they thought they had a majority in the House, and without waiting until the House met to decide, by constitutional vote, the question of confidence or want of confidence in the Government, they appealed, by petition, to His Excellency Lord Mulgrave for a dissolution of the House, and because His Excellency preferred to wait the constitutional period, and did not accede to their wishes, the following language was used by that paper:—

“It is our unanswerable arguments, which instead of meeting like men who have a just cause, they by sheltering themselves beneath the gabardine of the Lieutenant Governor, and then cry out from their dignified hiding place: ‘Hands off, don't touch Her Majesty's crinoline.’”

Then came the following:—

“But don't say a word—the Prince is coming—let bribery and corruption flourish in the land,—permit a Government to be sustained by perjury,—look coolly on while the Legislature of your country and all your most cherished institutions are brought into contempt; behold with indifference the prerogative of Majesty, to which, at such a crisis in our history, we naturally turn for redress, dragging in the dirt, while the voice of the people is stifled. * * * Lord Mulgrave may slumber and fancy that all is serene, and that a spiritless people will tamely submit to see a position maintained by perjury rewarded by the royal favour. Time will tell.”

This occurred in 1860, the year of the visit of the Prince of Wales. The Prince of Wales being about to arrive, His Excellency had not considered it desirable to convene the Legislature, but sent an invitation

to the members of the Assembly desiring them to be present and pay their respects in person to the Prince upon his arrival. The invitation was as follows :—

“ Though it has been considered unnecessary to summon the Legislature at a season which may be inconvenient, Lord Mulgrave commands me to say that he will be exceedingly glad if all the members of both branches of the Legislature can visit the capital for a few days to express in person the sentiments embodied in their address of last Session, and to take part in the festivities with which it is intended to greet His Royal Highness.”

The following was an extract from the reply of the hon. member for Cumberland :—

“ I feel compelled, as one of that body, (the Legislature) to decline respectfully the invitation to Her Majesty's Dockyard, with which I have been favoured.”

He appealed to the House if, under the circumstances under which they were written, and the time given for their consideration, the sentiments of disloyalty expressed in those words were not far stronger than those which were said to have been uttered by the hon. the Minister of Militia, or any person in Nova Scotia, during the exciting period through which the Province had passed at the time of Confederation. He thought it came with an ill grace from hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the facts to which he had referred, to charge any member on the Government side of the House with being disloyal or uttering disloyal sentiments. Reference had been made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), to the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Militia during the election campaign, in which he was reported to have said that, “ In Nova Scotia, they needed protection as against the Province of Ontario.” The people of that Province (Nova Scotia) were now in the Dominion of Canada, and they were obliged to make the best of it, and, therefore, whatever might be the result, beneficial or otherwise, they must submit; but he desired to place before the House the facts in connection with the case, and he had no doubt that, after being in possession of those facts, the House would see that, as a community, the people of that

Province had not been benefitted commercially by their entrance into the Confederation, and that there was very good reason why Nova Scotia should protest against any increase of duties for protective purposes. While they might be obliged, for the purposes of revenue, to submit to an increased tariff, they should not for protective purposes. When they entered Confederation, the duties in Nova Scotia were ten per cent., and they were sufficient for all purposes, including payment of the Civil List and the building of railways, roads and bridges; at the same time, their credit abroad was as good as that of any of the British Provinces. Upon entering the Dominion, their duties were increased to 15 per cent., the difference in which, as an hon. member had remarked, was sufficient to complete the Pictou Railway. The fact that the Province of Nova Scotia had been compelled to pay fifty per cent. more duty upon all dutiable articles than it had previously paid, was one of the objections to the Union. What was the consequence of the increase of duty? Instead of, as before, going into the markets of the world and buying in the cheapest, they had been obliged, in consequence of the increase in duty, to buy their goods in Canada instead of spending their gold abroad, where they took their wares to sell. During the investigation in connection with the coal trade held last Session by a committee of the House, of which he (Mr. Goudge) was a member, among other questions asked of one of the witnesses was the following: “ What is the value of trade as between the Upper and Lower Provinces?” The answer was given—“ At least eight millions.” He said to the witness—“ What proportion of that eight millions is contributed by the Upper Provinces?” The reply was, that out of eight millions, six millions were contributed by the Upper Provinces. That was, the Lower Provinces took six millions from the Upper Provinces, and sent to them in return two millions. Deducting the two millions from the six millions, there was a balance to be paid, in gold, of four millions, to the old Province of Canada. That was one of the benefits which accrued to

the Lower Provinces from their connection with the Upper Provinces in the matter of Confederation. The trade of the Lower Provinces was mainly made up from the fisheries, the shipping, lumbering, plaster and coal; and, while there might be some benefit arising to them from being in the Confederation, yet, looking at the commercial aspect of the case, they were compelled to admit that, on the termination of ten years they were, financially, not benefitted by the transaction, but were in a worse condition; and, moreover, that any increase of the tariff for protective purposes meant that the Lower Provinces should pay a higher price for their goods than hitherto, without reaping any corresponding advantage. With regard to the manufacturers of the Lower Provinces, in the matter of boots and shoes, for example, they had not to fear competition from England or the United States, but from the Upper Provinces. He had no sectional feeling, but, on the contrary, desired to see the country one in feeling; and he was happy to know that the exasperated feeling that existed in regard to Confederation, had in some degree passed away. But, if it was entirely to be removed, and we were to become one in feeling and trade, it could only be by each section of the Confederation deferring in some degree to the wants and necessities of the other sections. Nova Scotia, it was true, was not a very large portion of the Dominion; but, having been brought in unwillingly, and its trade being principally abroad, and in natural products more particularly, he thought a great deal of consideration should be given to it and the other Maritime Provinces in the matter of the arrangement of the tariff, and that they should not be obliged to pay increased duties for protective purposes. They might be willing and obliged to do it for revenue, but not for protective purposes; and if it was insisted upon by the advocates of protection, they would have to urge a policy in a contrary direction and ask for a lower tariff. He hoped, indeed, that, when opportunity offered and the revenue was in a flourishing condition, instead of advancing the tariff, the

MR. GOUDGE.

Government would be prepared to lower it. What was the question which had been agitating the country and making the principal cry of the party in Opposition for the past year or two? It was that of the necessity for an increase of duties for protective purposes. Yet, at the last meeting held in the city of Ottawa of the Dominion Board of Trade,—a body whose tendency, he had reason to believe, had always been towards Protection—they came to the conclusion, and passed a resolution embodying it, that the present tariff of 17½ per cent. was a fair one and such as should afford the manufacturers of the country sufficient protection. He, therefore, hoped that no hon. member, looking at the whole interests of the country, would seek an advance in that direction. It had often been stated that the present Government were rapidly losing their hold upon the affections of the people of the Dominion; but, from his knowledge, he was aware that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, in the constituency which he had the honour to represent, such was far from being the fact; on the contrary, the Administration occupied a higher position in the opinions and affections of the people than at any previous time. True, it had been stated, in a letter said to have been sent from Windsor to the organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, and used a day or two before the last election in Halifax,—probably with a view to influencing it,—that he (Mr. Goudge) had been through the county—probably referring to Hants—and, having heard of the defeat of Mr. Vail and the probable defeat of Mr. Jones, had stated that he had come to the conclusion that the days of the present Government were numbered, and that he had decided to link his fortunes with the Opposition party. He had been through the county during the last two months, and he was glad to find that, so far from having discovered such a state of feeling as had been reported, the people were generally satisfied with the administration of public affairs by the Government, and he had every reason to believe that they would return a representation to support the present Administration.

He believed that the state of feeling which he had indicated extended beyond the county of Hants; and that Nova Scotia, when appealed to, if it had any regard for its own interests and for good government, would return men who would support the present Government. A paragraph in the Speech with which he was especially pleased was that with reference to temperance, a subject that had much engaged the attention of the people of the Dominion, and at no time in the history of the country had it occupied a more important place than at the present. He was glad to learn that the Supreme Court, at its last session, decided on the question of jurisdiction, and, in consequence, the Government had inserted that paragraph in the Speech with the view of presenting to the House its views upon the subject, or, at least, that the subject of temperance should engage the attention of the House. He had not yet had an opportunity of learning in what direction the legislation upon this subject would be framed; but, having every confidence that the Government had the subject at heart and desired to see the progress of temperance in the Dominion, and that any measure they might bring forward would be of such a character as would forward the interests of temperance, he desired to leave it to their wisdom to present to Parliament such a resolution or Bill as might assist the progress of that great movement.

Mr. PERRY said he had been amazed that hon. members should have introduced religious questions into politics in the course of this debate. He trusted that a resolution would be placed on the Journals so that language such as the House had heard during the past two days would be entirely abolished. It was disgraceful that religion should be brought down to the level of politics, and it was desirable such action should cease. An attack had been made on Prince Edward Island, from which he came, on the ground that the hon. the Premier had not been received as might have been expected by the people of that Province. He (Mr. Perry) was present on all the occasions of the receptions tendered to the hon. the First Minister, with the

exception of that in his own county. He happened to be in Halifax on the arrival of the hon. the Premier and accompanied him to Souris. When he came to Mount Stewart, he was surprised at the large meeting and hearty cheers. At Souris, although the time for organizing the meeting was very short, the meeting was attended by two thousand people and was on a grand scale. The following day the hon. the First Minister held a great meeting at Charlottetown, at which he (Mr. Perry) had the honour of being present; the hon. the Premier made a speech, but it could not be supposed that he could give an outline of the policy of the Government of which he was the leader. When cheers were proposed for the hon. the Premier, they were unanimously given by the crowd. The same evening a banquet was given to the hon. gentleman, which was attended by the great majority of the wealth, respectability, and intelligence of Charlottetown, a circumstance to which he could testify, having been present. He would not attempt to defend the hon. the First Minister, because the hon. gentleman was well able to do it himself. He merely made these remarks for the information of the House, and in order to place Prince Edward Island in a right position before hon. members. Special reference was made in the Speech to the Fisheries Commission which sat at Halifax last summer. He was present and gave evidence before the Commissioners with respect to the advantages which the Americans obtained from fishing near the shores of the Island. He was gratified with the manner in which the Commission was conducted; and he was convinced from what he saw there that much was due to the evidence given from Prince Edward Island for obtaining the award decided on by the Commissioners. The Hon. Mr. Davies, who had charge of the evidence from the Island, had performed his duties to the entire satisfaction of all parties concerned; and to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was due a great deal of the credit of having brought about the award, as the evidence submitted from Prince Edward Island had been largely the means of

securing the award of five millions and a half of dollars. He hoped the Government would see that the public wants of the island were attended to in a proper manner. He was surprised to hear hon. members from Prince Edward Island state that a reaction had taken place on the Island. A reaction took place there many years ago, as far back as 1848. At that time the Conservatives had full sway. They even went so far that, when the Liberals attempted to settle the land question in a fair and equitable manner, and raise the land tax of the Province sixpence per hundred acres, they bribed the Governor of the day to back up the landlords. In 1851, the Conservatives opposed the measure in favour of Responsible Government. In 1852, when the Land Purchase Bill was passed in order to enable every man on the Island to become a freeholder, the Conservatives opposed that measure. In 1856, they opposed the Franchise Act, and, two years afterwards, when the Compensation Act was passed, the Conservatives opposed that measure. Since 1851, the Liberals had possessed a majority on the Island, and had it at the present day. Hon. gentlemen had been pleased to say that at the next general election six members would be returned from the Island to support the present Opposition. Reference, however, must have been made to some other island than that of Prince Edward, perhaps Anticosti. He was satisfied such remarks did not apply to the Island from which he came, at all events not to the county which he had the honour to represent, for it could not return one Conservative; on the contrary, it would return two staunch Reformers to support the Reform Government, and it was impossible for the county to do otherwise. They had been identified with Liberal principles since 1848, and were becoming stronger every day. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Pope) did not face himself or his colleague at the last general election, but sent down two of his friends and supporters. The result was that he defeated the strongest of those candidates by 1,200 votes. He would run at the next general election in company with his present colleague, and some electors who had voted

Mr. PERRY.

against them at the last election would give them their support. That was what he called a reaction, and a reaction in the right direction. It was impossible for the majority of the people of the Island to become Conservatives, for they were naturally Liberals and intended to continue so. It was well known that the two great questions of the day were Free-trade and Protection. The policy of the present Government was one of Free-trade. The policy of the Opposition had been, as far as he could understand, Protection; which meant that the consumers would have to pay more for the articles which they consumed. The hon. member for Queen's county advocated Free-trade, and yet, notwithstanding all that he had said, he belonged to the Opposition, whose policy was Protection. If the hon. gentleman said he would send six members to support the present Government, then he (Mr. Perry) could understand him; but if he said he would send six members here to support the Protection policy,—to support the policy of the late Government,—then he did not understand him. He said he was going to return six members, but the hon. gentleman would have hard enough times to get himself returned. The *Examiner* newspaper, published in Charlottetown, which was supposed to be the organ of the Conservatives, and the Protectionist paper of Summerside, called the *Summerside Progress*, had, of late, changed their policy; they saw that that policy only made the Opposition less popular. When these gentlemen came forward and declared their policy to be a Free-trade policy, that was the policy he would support. He did not care so much for parties, whether Government or Opposition; he believed in action, he did not believe in arguing. He did not believe in Orders in Council, such as they had in 1873, and nothing done. When the Government said they would build a lighthouse, he wanted the lighthouse built; when they said they would build a pier, or a breakwater, he wanted it built; he did not want any of these humbugging Orders in Council, which were a mere delusion, passed for the purpose of catching votes. He wanted an honest policy.

Mr. BAIN said that, in rising to address the House, he did not propose to add much to the stock of information they had got; but, as the Opposition had intimated that they did not intend to propose any amendment, and as they had systematically followed a certain line—he he could not help feeling that it was only justice to himself and to his constituents that he should, in a few words, express his views with respect to some of the resolutions referred to in the Address, in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. So far as the first clause was concerned, which referred to the fact that they were called together simply for the discharge of the ordinary business of the country, he thought it patent on the face of it that they had not just now any of those great political issues that divided political parties in years gone by, and which were on those occasions burning questions; therefore, he could coincide with the Government in putting that statement before the House. But the Opposition were evidently determined that, if they had no great political issues to divide them, they would take very good care that the party lines should not be obliterated in consequence of that, but that they would keep up a distinctive organization, by which they had always been known as Conservatives, and that their line of policy would be one of continuous attack upon the Government and upon their measures. In respect to the reference that was made in the next clause to His Excellency's visit to the North-West Province of Manitoba, he concurred entirely with the remarks made by the seconder of the Address. While he regretted that this was probably the last occasion in which this Parliament would be opened by His Excellency Lord Dufferin as Governor-General, yet he rejoiced to remember that these visits that he had made throughout the length and breadth of the Provinces would, at a future day, bear fruit that would be of benefit to us as a Dominion; because it was manifest that a gentleman who had taken so much pains as Lord Dufferin had to inform

himself of the wants and necessities and capacities of the various Provinces constituting this Dominion, with the tact and versatility he had displayed in reaching various classes of the community, would be eminently valuable in dealing with Colonial affairs at a future period in the Imperial Parliament. In respect to the efforts referred to in the following clauses of the Address, in promoting the exhibition of Canadian manufactured products at the Exhibition in Sydney, New South Wales, as well as at Paris, these efforts had been so far eminently successful, and he was happy to find that both sides of the House concurred in giving a fair meed of praise to the Government for the efforts they had made in that connection. While there were many things in connection with their line of policy which the Opposition had attacked on public grounds, yet, in looking at the efforts of the Government to introduce in these distant countries the productions of the Dominion, he felt that their policy in that respect was one that would commend itself to the calm consideration of everyone that had the welfare and the future prosperity of this Dominion at heart. They had heard a great deal about the necessity of building up our local manufactures, and they had had pointed out to them the progress that the United States had made in consequence of the line of policy that had been there pursued. He remembered at the present moment that our interests were wide and varied; that we were not alone a manufacturing or an agricultural Dominion, such as the western Province with which he was more immediately connected might claim to be. He remembered that down on the shores of the Atlantic they had a hardy and vigorous population, who had all their lives long followed maritime pursuits, and had found an outlet for their energies in sailing. He thought, when the Ministry of the day took those steps to secure an exhibition of our manufactures in those distant countries, they were doing just the very best thing to build up the future prosperity of the Dominion. He conceived that any steps they could take to develop our merchant marine

and shipping interests, to keep up that inter-communication with distant countries, by which they would take from us our natural and manufactured products and give us in exchange their natural and manufactured products, would go to build up the substantial welfare of the Dominion at large. He was no friend of that particular policy—that Chinese-wall policy—that would exclude anyone from participating in our business connections. He did not believe that the Government of the day would consult the best interests of this Dominion by endeavouring to exclude that inter-communication with other countries which would develop our marine, and give our ships and vessels on the ocean that business which he conceived would be to the best interests of the eastern portion of this country. He could not help thinking that their friends from the west, who were advocating that particular Protection policy, which they were told was one of the planks of the Conservative platform, were not taking into account the whole interests of the Dominion, but were somewhat circumscribing their views to the interests of particular localities. He could not but remember that one of the schemes which was now being actively carried out by the Government, which was endorsed by the country at large, and started by the Administration of his right hon. friend who now led the Opposition,—he referred to the enlargement of our canal system,—was one that had involved us in a very large expenditure. He could not help thinking that that enlargement of our canals, placed alongside and parallel with the extreme tariff of our American friends, was not one that would yield to us any adequate return for the expenditure connected therewith, if we adopted the policy advocated by the Opposition. He could not conceive that we could adopt any policy that would be more agreeable to our friends south of the line, who were actively competing for the carrying trade of the great North-West States, which were now rapidly becoming their chief grain-producing region; he did not think we could more efficiently aid our American neighbours than by adopting the policy that had

MR. BAIN.

been suggested by the Opposition. In thus expressing himself in respect to that, he was at the same time quite as far removed from holding those extreme Free-trade views that their friends in Opposition were so particularly anxious to attach to the Government and their supporters on the present occasion. Without alluding to the necessities of this country, that would require a revenue tariff for many years to come, to meet our obligations and enable us to keep our credit good with our creditors outside, he, at the same time, believed that there was a certain meed of protection to which our manufactures were entitled; and he could not help heartily endorsing the action of the Dominion Board of Trade in their recent session in this city, when they passed that resolution expressing their approval of the tariff as it stood, and expressing the opinion that, if the necessities of the Dominion at any future day should require an increased tariff, it should be so arranged as to promote in the best manner the welfare of our manufacturing industries. He could not help thinking, in looking at the interests of the Dominion at large, that the policy of the Government, as thus endorsed by the Dominion Board of Trade, was one that would commend itself to moderate men on both sides of the House. There was another feature in connection with this matter that had been brought prominently before the House, more particularly by the member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) and the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton). His hon. friend from Centre Wellington seemed to take under his particular care the agricultural population of this Dominion. He did not know what particular line of medicine he proposed to deal out to them that was going to specially facilitate their interests. As an agriculturalist himself—it was the occupation he had been brought up to from his earliest days, and it was the occupation he expected to follow, after he either was driven from political life or ceased from it of his own accord; and from its having been his life-long occupation, it was one in which he had a special personal interest—he could not help thinking it would have been just as wise on the part of that

gentleman if he had been a little less anxious to propagate particular nostrums for the curing of what he considered agricultural ills. He could not help thinking that, so far as the agricultural population was concerned, they might be fairly left to attend to their own interests, and might be left to express their own views and sentiments. He had never heard that they had been at all anxious to come before this House and urge Protection in their own particular interests; it had been left entirely to gentlemen such as his hon. friend. Local politicians sometimes said that there were other interests involved as well as the good of the country at large; but he would not say that on this particular occasion they came to the surface. In connection with this same matter he could not help noticing that in another paragraph of the Address reference was made to the development of the North-West Territories and the Province of Manitoba, with the view of attracting in that direction settlers, and giving them better facilities for the improvement of their territory. They were told that,

“As much of the prosperity of the Dominion depends on the rapid settlement of the fertile lands in those territories, it is desirable and necessary to facilitate such settlement as much as possible.”

In his position, as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, he had had, personally, not a little intercourse with men whose reputation was above suspicion, and who were most intimately acquainted with the wants and capacities of that North-West Territory, and who spoke highly of it; and it was only yesterday that, along with other members of this House, he had had the pleasure of listening, in another Chamber, to a very instructive and interesting address from His Lordship the Bishop of Saskatchewan, in which he expressed very strong views respecting the fertility and capacity of that North-West Territory. These views and sentiments were endorsed by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), who had been for some time chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Colonization. He could not help thinking that, so

far as the agricultural population of these older Provinces, and that of the more eastern parts of this Dominion, were concerned, before many years they would be called on to compete with the natural grain productions of that North-West Territory, where, undoubtedly, both wheat and barley, and the staple cereals could be produced at a much less cost than they could in the older settled portions of this Dominion. When his friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) was dilating so fluently, as he always did, in connection with this same protection that he asked should be extended to the Canadian farmer, against the agricultural productions of the United States, he could not help thinking they would have, before very long, to face the enormous production of our fertile prairies of the North-West that must, before many years, largely increase our exports of grain. He was pleased to find this particular paragraph in the Address, because, although the natural productions of that region would compete with them as farmers in the more eastern portion of the country, yet he was satisfied that, if the policy that the present Government maintained in connection with the business of our country was in future carried out, they would have open to them other markets that would yield quite as favourable returns to make their business profitable, which the policy enunciated by his friends in the Opposition would operate against our successfully occupying. While our American cousins were quoted to us as an eminently successful people, by the adoption of an extreme protective tariff, he remembered, looking at it from the agricultural standpoint, that, notwithstanding the extraordinary progress that nation had made in manufacturing, yet they had never been able to overtake the steady increase of agricultural production in that country; and to-day they found his hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) lamenting that American oats were sent into our market from the West, and sold here at 31c. and 32c. per bushel, to the detriment of the farmers here. He also knew that the production of wheat, corn, and other staples of that

class in the United States was not dependent upon the home market there for the price that the agriculturists should receive for their productions. The price they received at home was regulated, not by the amount of consumption that had been created by these manufacturing centres, but by the proportion of that surplus production that was placed upon the world's market in England, less the cost of carrying that grain to that market. He could not help thinking that, if these results occurred here, as undoubtedly they did with our American cousins, who shipped a very large amount of surplus grain to the English market, the farmers would have their price regulated by that market; and, if the Western American farmers with their protective tariff had to be content with such prices for their oats as had been quoted by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and compelled to put them on our market at such low rates, he could not help thinking that that system was one that we did not want repeated here for our agricultural population, and he thought the policy of the Government was better calculated to promote the interests of the farmers. They found, so far as barley was concerned, both the Canadian and American markets had been glutted this season by over-production; and it was to the fact that commercial men found an outlet for this staple on the world's market in England that they owed the fact that they were realising the price for their barley that they were. When they remembered that the great plains of the North-West would undoubtedly produce cereals at a cheaper rate than they could be produced in the older Provinces, he thought they ought to pause and ask themselves whether the propositions of the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), or the declarations of the Conservatives at large, were likely to be for the benefit of the agricultural interests of this Dominion. In speaking of the style of Protection which their Opposition friends proposed to accord to the farmer in Canada, he could not help thinking that they sometimes under-estimated the intelligence of the agricultural population,

MR. BAIN.

when they told them that the tariff that the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) initiated during the short period of what he called his National Policy, was a tariff that was created in the interest of the agricultural population of this Dominion. At an earlier day, before he embarked in politics, he remembered hearing the millers talking loudly of the benefit that tariff was to the Canadian farmer, and what a clear gain it was to them, this being before they had this intimate connection with the Maritime Provinces which now constituted them a Dominion. But, when he looked into the arrangement of that tariff, it was not so clear to him that it was created at all in the interests of the agricultural population. What were the facts in connection with that matter? He found that, on the great staple of wheat, they had placed a duty of four cents a bushel; but they had not placed exactly an equivalent duty on American flour to make it correspond, but had placed a duty of 25c. a barrel on American flour; thus practically giving the miller a premium of about seven or eight cents on every barrel of flour that he made out of American wheat, rather than out of Canadian wheat. He could not help remembering, when he heard the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) promulgating these particular theories, the time when the late Government used to repeat the same thing to the farmers, and tell them they were being protected. He did not appreciate that class of Protection; but he was free to admit that he believed it was the only style of Protection they would be able to realise from the right hon. gentleman who led the Opposition, should any political changes place him again in the control of the affairs of the country. He was satisfied that, so far as the agricultural population of this Dominion were concerned, what they wanted was a fair field and no favour, and to be severely let alone. He believed that, if they began shuffling the dice for the purpose of getting the advantage in this Protection race, they would certainly come out behind. He had no faith in the man that had enunciated this protective theory in the agricultural interest.

So far as this agitation was concerned, it was not commenced by the agricultural population, but it was commenced by such gentlemen as he had referred to. He could not congratulate his friends in Opposition upon the line of policy that they had developed so far. They had, during the past summer, held a series of meetings throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, in which the political doings of the past had been freely and fully discussed; and they had had a repetition of that same bitter line of attack that the Opposition indulged in here during the past Session, only, if possible, with increased intensity. They had, in connection with that, a reiteration of charges freely made of corruption and improper conduct against the Ministry of the day. They had been told that they had granted contracts to political friends whereby they had sacrificed the interests of the country; that, for the purpose of benefitting their individual relatives, they had improperly let contracts. They had had no end of that class of charges freely made throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. He remembered that, when the political party that now controlled the destinies of this country were in Opposition, when the present Postmaster General formulated his charges against the late Government, he did not go out to the country and make wild insinuations and statements in respect to that matter, but he came before the House and stated that he had reason to believe that, if he had an opportunity, and they would give him a committee, he could substantiate grave charges against the Government of the day. The House would remember also, in connection with the Secret Service money investigation, that the charges were not paraded around the country, but were first brought directly before the House; and the extraordinary revelations of corruption in the Northern Railway management, involving members of this House, were brought out also before a committee of investigation. When the Opposition clamoured about the mismanagement of the present Government and the misappropri-

ation of public funds, he wondered whether they remembered that they had been prepared to accept a hundred thousand pounds sterling in settlement of the liability of the Northern Railway, while the present Government, after investigating the affairs of the railway, managed to collect just double that amount? In addition to which, after a further investigation before this House, that Railway Company had been asked to hand over a misappropriation of \$27,000 to \$30,000 additional. That matter was not paraded around the country by the supporters of the Government; the investigation was gone straight into; the facts were brought to the surface, and those who had perpetrated the wrong had to bear the responsibility and the blame. Without attempting to interfere with the line adopted by the Opposition in attacking the Government of the day, he would say that, looking at what had transpired in the past, he thought it would be much better for those hon. gentlemen, instead of making charges at picnics, to ask this House for a committee before which an investigation might take place, and the charges be substantiated by sworn evidence. As a humble member of the House, he should be pleased to do everything he could to enable them to have the means of substantiating their charges before a committee of the House, and he thought it was due to their position as a great political party to do something more than bandy these charges around the country as they had been doing. He felt, so far as he was personally concerned, that he had trespassed upon the patience of the House, but his only excuse was that, while he claimed the right to address the House as often and at such length as he pleased, he had generally abstained from troubling it. But there were times when he thought it right that individual members should express their views in regard to the leading questions of the day, and he personally did not feel inclined to withdraw from the present Government that support and confidence which they had received from him in times past, simply because of the charges made by hon. gentlemen in Opposition. If they withdrew their confidence from the gentlemen now

in power, they had to ask themselves, as wise men should, whom they would place in office? He did not complain of the attacks made on the Government of the day, because he considered that an active Opposition was in the interest of the country; for, however pure any Government might be, it was better for being looked after, and no set of men were better able to watch a Government than the members of the present Opposition. They were conversant with the ins and outs of political life, and the investigations to which he had referred showed that the present Government had not had any peculiar monopoly of the means of improperly controlling public affairs. For himself, while there were no burning political issues dividing parties, such as there were in times past, while the questions for consideration were largely those of administrative capacity, he did not feel inclined to withdraw his support from the Government of the day, who he believed had administered the affairs of the Dominion to the best of their capacity, and, he believed, had more efficiently and economically administered them than the hon. gentlemen now in Opposition. While the Government continued to act in this manner, he should continue to extend to them his support.

Motion made and question proposed :

"1. That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session; and further to assure His Excellency: that, we learn with satisfaction that His Excellency, in again summoning us for the despatch of business, is able to inform us that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires our attendance."

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"2. That it affords us great pleasure to know that His Excellency had an opportunity, before his departure from Canada, of visiting the Province of Manitoba and a portion of the outside territories, which visit His Excellency accomplished during last autumn, and that His Excellency has now had the advantage of visiting every Province in the Dominion during the term of his government of Canada."

MR. TUPPER said he wished to avail himself of this opportunity afforded by the motion which was just put by the Speaker, to make as brief a reply as possible to the statement of the hon.

the Minister of Militia, in reply to the remarks he (Mr. Tupper) had addressed to the House on a previous occasion. He might say, at the outset, that he quite concurred in the remarks made by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young), that, if anything was to be deprecated in this House, it was any hon. member bringing forward old, stale refuted charges, and he thought gentlemen on both sides of the House would acquit him of being open to any censure of that kind. He had endeavoured, in his remarks, to avoid subjects of that kind, and to confine himself to reasons which he had thought sufficiently strong against the entrance of the Minister of Militia into the Cabinet. He had confined himself, therefore, to that question. He had deduced, as a ground of objection, the fact that the hon. gentleman was in strong, clearly defined antagonism to the Government of the day on a question of public policy which he (Mr. Jones) had described as involving three or four millions of dollars per annum, namely the West India trade, in which the constituency he (Mr. Jones) represented was largely interested, and which was a question involving not only the interests of his (Mr. Jones's) constituency, but almost the entire Province of which he was one of the representatives. He had presented to the House, as he had felt it his duty to do, the great objection which existed to the advent of a gentleman to a Ministry which was uncompromisingly hostile to the views which he had propounded as being in the best interests of the country. He (Mr. Jones) replied that gentlemen in office might differ on minor points. So that what a year ago was a question of burning interest in the estimation of the hon. gentleman—a question which required him on two occasions to remonstrate with the Government of the day—became, when it was convenient to the Government to ask him to be their colleague, and to associate himself with them in office, a minor question. He (Mr. Tupper) left it to him to settle with his constituents, and to justify the attitude which he occupied in relation to that matter. He (Mr. Tupper) also drew the attention of the House to the fact that, on a question

MR. BAIN.

of the gravest importance to this country—the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway,—to which the First Minister and his colleagues stood committed in the most decided manner, and which the great organ of the Government had declared to be of the most vital importance, the hon. gentleman had not only avowed, no longer ago than last Session, his opposition to the scheme, but had declared that his opinion was that it was the duty of the Government to repudiate that obligation *in toto*. He (Mr. Tupper) thought he was not exceeding his duty when he called the attention of the House to the fact that, when the hon. gentleman propounded the policy of total repudiation, some explanation was required on the part of his (Mr. Jones's) colleagues and himself for the presence of those gentlemen in the same Administration. The hon. gentleman closed his somewhat lengthened and animated address without any reference to that matter; he (Mr. Tupper) presumed, because he (Mr. Jones) felt there was no answer that could be given, because, on such a question, involving such a large expenditure of money, nothing could justify the association in the same Government of gentlemen who declared that it was necessary to go forward and carry out the responsibility which rested upon them in relation to that great work, and a gentleman who only last Session told this House that they ought to have repudiated the whole thing. He (Mr. Tupper) had drawn the attention of the House to the position the hon. gentleman occupied as having held sentiments which were utterly inconsistent with the views of the present or any other Canadian Administration. He had also stated to the House, on what he considered competent authority, that the hon. gentleman had, on a former occasion, committed himself to what was so utterly at variance with loyal sentiments, so utterly at variance with loyalty to Canada, so utterly hostile to this Confederation as it now existed, as to render it impossible for him to take a seat in the Government as it now existed, without some retraction of the sentiments he had then expressed—unless they chose

to present a spectacle of utter inconsistency to the country. What was the hon. gentleman's reply? In the language of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) he had used charges which were not only old and stale, but which had been refuted and abandoned—charges which had been so utterly refuted that they had ceased to be used as weapons of political warfare. These, however, the hon. gentleman, unable to defend himself, had found it necessary, on a recent occasion, to bring forward. He (Mr. Tupper) supposed he had done that for the same reason as that which had animated him in the contest in Halifax. He had stated there that, until he (Mr. Tupper) presented himself on the scene, the contest had been carried on in an orderly manner. The hon. gentleman knew that he was unwilling that he (Mr. Tupper) should be present at a meeting which was arranged between the other candidate and himself; the result being that he (Mr. Tupper) addressed a public meeting for two hours, and then went to Digby; and that there he had made no references to the hon. gentleman, except to say that, as he was to meet him face to face soon, he would not refer to him, but would discuss other questions. He had only said that, by his own admission of a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, the hon. gentleman had been obliged to present himself again before his constituents. But what did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) do, when he (Mr. Tupper) was a hundred miles away, at Digby? He had devoted an entire evening to him; so much so that Mr. Richey, his opponent, said: "Take Dr. Tupper out of Mr. Jones's address, and I have nothing to answer." The hon. gentleman had then brought up a charge of his (Mr. Tupper's) being disqualified to sit in Parliament, because he had leased a house in Hollis-street to the Government; because he had been interested in the Pictou Railway contract, and because he was improperly connected with the Spring Hill mines—charges the two latter of which had been refuted long ago, and, in regard to the other, the hon. gentleman knew that there was a very easy manner of dealing with it. He

(Mr. Jones) had said that he would bring that before a Committee of this House: he (Mr. Tupper) invited him to do so. The hon. gentleman had said that the transaction was a colourable one. The colourable transaction consisted in this: that when the Government applied to his (Mr. Tupper's) son, who was the owner of that house, they obtained it at \$600 a year, precisely the same price as the previous tenant was paying for it, and that, soon after, his son had sold this house, which he had leased to the Government of Canada for \$600 a year, to a building society of Halifax for \$9,500. The House could, therefore, judge whether there was any extraordinary or undue charge made to the Government for the property while it was in their possession. The hon. gentleman had said the transaction was colourable, because his (Mr. Tupper's) son was a minor, and, therefore, he (Mr. Tupper) received the benefit. The hon. gentleman ought to have known the circumstances before he spoke. He (Mr. Tupper) had stated that, if the hon. gentleman would take the case before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, where witnesses could be sworn, he would undertake to show, by witnesses, that there was not the shadow of a shade of foundation for this matter being brought before the House at all. He was prepared to show that his son was of age months before the house was conveyed to him by himself (Mr. Tupper); he was prepared to show that he had no interest whatever in the property, or in any rents to be derived from it; and that, on matters where it was easy for the hon. gentleman to obtain the fullest knowledge and information, he had shown to the House, as he had shown to the country, that, finding himself unable to defend his own course by any justification of his own conduct, unable to bring forward any grounds to show that he had performed any services to his constituents, he had been driven to the necessity of not only making an attack upon him (Mr. Tupper), but of making that attack upon questions which he must have known, or, if he did not know, he ought to have known, as he had the means of knowing, were

MR. TUPPER.

utterly baseless and foundationless. He intended to deal as briefly as possible with some of the questions of fact which were at issue between them. He was somewhat surprised on reading the report of the speech of the hon. the Minister of Militia in the *Globe* newspaper. The gentleman who, he supposed, took charge of the reports and exercised supervision over them, was an adept in debate. He observed that gentleman listening with great attention to the remarks of the hon. Minister, and he was curious to see whether the speech would appear in the *Globe*. He (Mr. Tupper) was quite certain that, as there were several contradictions in the speech, it would not appear in that journal on the following day. Not a word appeared: it must be subjected to revision, and must be pared and toned down, and its inconsistencies removed. He would direct the attention of the House to a single fact in that connection. The hon. the Minister of Militia made two statements directly opposed to each other. In one part of his speech he stated, in defence of a remark he had made on the floor of the House a year ago, that, if the county of Halifax were open, it would return a supporter of the Government by as large a majority as he had himself received in 1874, namely, 2,147; that the fact of his majority at the late election being little over 200 was due to the gross misstatement and misrepresentation made by him (Mr. Tupper) during the election. That statement was, however, omitted from the report of the *Globe*, because the hon. the Minister made another statement, that he trusted the hon. member for Cumberland would visit his constituency again, because, in the district which he visited, he (Mr. Jones) obtained an increased majority of ten. It would not answer the purposes of the *Globe* to publish both statements. He merely drew the attention of the House to those facts to show that the report in the *Globe* was a revised and even garbled report, in which important statements were omitted. The *Ottawa Free Press* of Feb. 13th, said:

“When he (Mr. Jones) made reference to the majority of last year, he had said then, and

he said now, that if it had not been for the grossest misrepresentations, if it had not been for the promises the hon. gentleman held out, his majority would have been nearly as large as at the previous election."

In spite of the declaration of the hon. gentleman that the county of Halifax would return a Reform member by a majority of upwards of 2,000, the hon. the Minister had only obtained a majority of a little over 200 at the last election, and yet he ventured to deny that the tide of public opinion was setting strongly against the Government. The hon. gentleman had failed to show that the slightest misrepresentation had been made by him (Mr. Tupper) during that election; he dealt with the questions of the day, and with the position of the hon. gentleman. The hon. the Minister had invited him to visit his constituency at the next election. He accepted the invitation in advance, and, if his life and health were spared, he would visit the constituency, and, if his efforts on the last occasion had been sufficient to reduce the hon. gentleman's majority nearly two thousand votes, the Conservative party might rely on the balance being turned when he had an opportunity to discuss political questions at greater length than on the last occasion. Another matter to which he wished to call the attention of the House was the gross attack made on the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia, which had also been judiciously suppressed in the *Globe*. In regard to the defence of the Civil Service made by the hon. gentleman, he maintained that it was absolutely necessary, after what had transpired in respect of the payment of enormous sums of public money, in violation of the statute law of the land, by the Government to various parties, including members of the Government and members of Parliament, that a stricter system of auditing the Public Accounts should be established. The House would be satisfied that such scandals had never before existed as those it had been called upon to deal with in relation to the payment of public moneys in violation of the law.

MR. MILLS: Secret Service money, for instance.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. member ought to know that Secret Service money was not audited, and did not come under that head. The sum of \$69,000 was paid over to railway companies during the last general election, having been taken out of the Treasury in violation of the law. That was followed up by the illegal payment of \$24,000 to two members of the Government for services for which it was incompetent for them to receive payment, and, when one of those hon. gentlemen resigned his seat and was then indignantly rejected by his constituents, the Government took into the Cabinet that hon. member's partner, who had been equally guilty in those transactions. Hon. members of the Government had better settle those questions among themselves, for the House was satisfied that under those circumstances a change in the system of auditing could not be made at too early a date. The hon. the Minister of Militia, who had made a defence of the Civil Service, no doubt felt greatly for that service when he had illegally obtained \$26,000 from the public Treasury in company with his partner, the benefit of which he had now in his pocket. The hon. gentleman had stated that he had made no money out of the transaction, and had been called upon to pay \$2,000 as his share of the loss incurred in the *Citizen*. That being accepted as true, and he would not question that such was the case, it would be interesting to know what increased sum he would have had to pay if he had not been enabled to draw such enormous sums out of the Treasury of the country for the benefit of that company. The amount would probably not have been less than \$10,000 except for the moneys received from the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia and the Dominion Government. Such was the qualification the present Government required, to cause them to place a gentleman in a high office and hold him up to the country as one who would maintain its standard of public morality and purity in public transactions. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Tupper) should be the last man to charge any one with corruption. Why? He had been in public life nearly 24 years, during

which time not a dollar of public money had come into his possession by any improper means; and, if such could be proved against him, he pledged himself to resign his seat in Parliament and retire from public life for ever. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) deprecated the introduction of stale, exploded charges into the debate; but what would he say, when a Minister of the Crown who was charged in an open and straightforward manner, and on broad public grounds, with having improperly and illegally obtained public moneys, had revived the stale Pictou Railway story, which originated in 1865, was subjected to a close examination in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, and settled. The hon. member had read Mr. Archibald's speech as evidence against him (Mr. Tupper) of corruption. He would like to know whether the hon. the First Minister, ten years hence, would be willing to accept the speeches delivered by the Opposition at the present time, as sufficient evidence of corruption? And yet that was the only evidence which the hon. the Minister of Militia possessed in support of those old, stale, exploded railway slanders. Not only so, but he had the handwriting of Mr. Archibald, the Lieut.-Governor of Nova Scotia, before him, stating that he never implied that he (Mr. Tupper) had been guilty of corruption, or thought of making any such charge. The hon. gentleman had said that out of that railway contract some one had suddenly risen from a state of pauperism to that of a full-blown millionaire. If that was intended to refer to him, it did not apply. At whom, then, was the blow aimed? It was aimed at Mr. Fleming, who, no doubt, made money out of the contract, but made it fairly and legitimately.

MR. JONES: He was not the only one.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman knew that the term used had no more application to him than to himself (Mr. Jones). He had never been in a position to be open to any such insinuation, and he could establish, by just as good evidence, that the hon. the Minister of Militia had grown rich by

MR. TUPPER.

robbing his commercial partner, as that hon. gentleman could show that he (Mr. Tupper) had made money out of any improper transactions, or by improper means. Yet he had dared, in the presence of the House, to bring forward such a charge, which was not only without a shadow of foundation, but which, if it reflected on any one, reflected on one of the highest, most respectable, and most respected officials to be found in the public service of Canada. That hon. gentleman knew that the contract with Mr. Fleming was drawn by the Hon. W. A. Henry, since appointed to the Supreme Court by the Government of which he was a member, and that by the concurrence of himself and his party. Yet that hon. gentleman, who was his colleague in the Nova Scotia Government, who had drawn the contract and had defended it on the floor of the Legislature as one eminently in the public interest, without any evidence except the criticism which the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Archibald, considered it was his duty to make, was thus assailed by the Government. That was the only evidence the hon. gentleman was able to offer to the House. Why was it that a Minister of the Crown should demean himself by bringing forward an old story, an exploded charge, which was without a shadow of foundation? It was because the hon. gentleman, when attacked, not on private but on broad public grounds, as every independent member had a right to attack any hon. gentleman in the position occupied by the Minister of Militia, had no defence to offer in justification of his position, and was obliged to occupy the time of the House—as he had that of his constituents—by dealing with old questions. He brought the Pictou Railway question up in 1872, over his own signature, and he received his reply. The result was that, instead of being returned to Parliament, he was left at home and the man whom he had assailed was sustained by two members elected for the county of Halifax, and every representative of the Province, with one exception. That ought to have taught him a lesson. In regard to the Spring Hill Mines, he had already explained to the House that

the Order in Council was passed while he was absent from the country, and the best evidence that it was a proper transaction was that the preceding Government placed it in the Statute-book. He was 3,000 miles away when Mr. Black, one of the leading merchants in Halifax, went to the office of the mines with the *Royal Gazette*, and made application for that mining claim. The hon. the Minister of Militia was well aware that this question was made the subject of an exhaustive examination, promoted by his enemies in the Legislature of Nova Scotia. They were unable to produce a tittle of evidence to injure him (Mr. Tupper), because none existed. As he had said before, he had been 3,000 miles away when the application was made by Mr. Black, who, it was said, did not appear when summoned before a committee of the House. He did not know anything about that, whether it was the case or not, but he had Mr. Black's evidence; and he did not think that the Minister of Militia, or any hon. gentleman, would venture to say that Charles H. M. Black was not a gentleman of as high social, commercial and personal standing in the city of Halifax as himself (Mr. Jones). Mr. Black was a member of one of the oldest and most respectable families of Halifax, and a merchant of the highest standing and character, and of great wealth, as were all the family. He was worth, at that time, he supposed, £100,000; and yet this leading merchant was branded as a conspirator by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), the other night, and as having lent himself to a base and improper intrigue. He held Mr. Black's testimony in his hand, and the hon. gentleman knew that, wherever he (Mr. Jones) and Mr. Black were known, Mr. Black's character for veracity was not inferior to his own, and that his word went as far as that of the hon. gentleman, who would not undertake to say that this was not the case. Mr. Black said:

"Halifax, 19th December, 1871,

"HONOURABLE CHARLES TUPPER, C. B.,
Ottawa:—

"MY DEAR SIR,— After the repeated attacks upon you by a portion of the city press, touching the Spring Hill Mine, I have

thought it but right that I should state the fact that I had no communication with you respecting licenses to search for coal at Spring Hill or elsewhere, previous to the application made by me in June, 1865, and that I received no intimation from you that an Order in Council had passed authorizing the granting of second rights to search.

"In June, 1868, when you were in England, it was thought by the friends interested with me that you could be of essential service to us in bringing the mine to the notice of English capitalists, and I accordingly executed a Power of Attorney, authorizing you to sell the mining rights I had acquired, which was duly transmitted to you; and in 1869 it was determined to convey to you one undivided fifth of three square miles, of which I held leases from Mr. Annand's Government.

"You are aware this explanation was at your service last summer, and you can now make what use of it you please.

"Regretting you should have been the subject of so much unmerited abuse,

"I remain, yours very truly,

(Signed) "C. H. M. BLACK."

It was thus proved that his offer to sell the mine under a Power of Attorney was eleven months after he had ceased to be a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, when he was just as free to speculate in mining as was the hon. the Minister of Militia. There was testimony of the very highest character. The other points raised were met by the affidavit of the Clerk of the Executive Council and utterly disproved. The verdict of the whole Province was taken after a year of the most exhaustive examination by these gentlemen upon it, and this verdict was as he had previously stated. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Tupper) had made a very large sum of money out of this transaction, and that he had not spent a cent upon it. Where did the hon. gentleman get his authority for that statement? It was not true. He, with other gentlemen, had expended a large amount of money to explore, develop, and open the mine, which was a valuable one. It had been stocked, if he remembered right, with something like \$300,000, and he was happy to say that the parties who purchased the stock had had the pleasure of dividing a seven per cent. dividend on the past year a month ago. As he said before, if ever there was an old and stale slander, it was this transaction of 1865, concerning which, for six years after it took place, neither in the Legislature

of Nova Scotia nor anywhere else, was any person found to say a word. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had not thought it beneath him, or rather he thought that the hon. gentleman did think it beneath him, to bring this charge; but so hard was the hon. gentlemen pressed that he (Mr. Jones) had nothing else to do, and had no other reasons for assailing him the other night on public grounds, except to fall back upon that old and stale slander as a means of vindication. The hon. gentleman said that another charge of his was that he (Mr. Jones) had formerly acted with the Conservative party. He had mentioned to the House that the only qualification, saving the ability the hon. gentleman had shown in getting public money out of the Treasury contrary to law, the hon. gentleman possessed for sitting in the Reform Government, was the fact that, when the great question of the Union of these Provinces was taken up, the hon. gentleman had deserted him (Mr. Tupper) and gone into the ranks of the Anti-Unionists, and had shown the most bitter and undying hostility to that measure. This was the hon. gentleman's sole qualification for sitting alongside of the hon. member for Lambton, whose great claim upon the people of this country existed in the fact that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had taken part in bringing about the Union of these Provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said this measure had been improperly carried; that it ought to have been fought and abandoned, and that no man should have been sustained who had carried that measure in the way he (Mr. Tupper) did. He was glad to be able to say that the hon. gentleman considered this a minor point too, because this did not prevent the hon. gentleman sitting alongside of the hon. member for Lambton, the Prime Minister, who stood in precisely the same position as himself (Mr. Tupper). Those who took the trouble to read the Confederation Debates which took place at Quebec would find that, when exactly such a resolution was proposed as the hon. the Minister of Militia maintained ought to have been carried, to send this question of Union to the polls, the Hon. George Brown came to the front, and, in a

most able and vigorous manner, showed the utter unconstitutionality of the whole proposition. When his hon. friend the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) was fighting for just such a resolution, the Hon. George Brown took up the cudgels and stated that to pass a measure to be submitted to the people would have been a simple insult to the Crown; and who sustained the Hon. George Brown in that position? Why the hon. member for Lambton, and they had the names on the Journals of the Parliament of Canada of those who voted down the resolution for which the hon. the Minister of Militia said he (Mr. Jones) was justified in deserting him (Mr. Tupper), and that this was an act which ought to have driven him (Mr. Tupper) out of public life and kept him out of it for ever. He supposed the hon. gentleman had also discovered that this was a minor point and that, when a portfolio was offered him, this was no reason why he should not sit down under the wing of the hon. member for Lambton, enjoying the sweets of office. No act in the public life of the hon. member for Lambton reflected more credit on him (Mr. Mackenzie), in his judgment, than the stand which he took on that occasion. On constitutional grounds both the hon. the Premier and the Hon. George Brown were not only justified, but they were more than justified, in resisting the invasion then attempted on British institutions, one which formed no part of our Constitution, and which could not be carried out except at very great inconvenience; and, in fact, he knew of no mode by which the public sentiment could have been expressed on that question. He was proud to say that that great organ of public opinion, the *Globe*, on that occasion, and, subsequently, when he was fighting this battle, did not do as did the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and the hon. the Minister of Militia now—treat this as a ground why he (Mr. Tupper) was undeserving of public confidence. The *Globe* had also done him the great honour of reproducing the argument he had made in England, and had called the attention of the people of Canada to the fact that the evidence and constitutional authorities

he had cited must for ever settle the question as to whether right, proper, and constitutional proceedings had been adopted in connection with Confederation. He had heard the hon. member for Lambton say that the people of Ontario were united on this subject, but he (Mr. Tupper) had had no means of knowing that the hostility of the people of Nova Scotia was as great as it really was to that measure.

MR. MILLS: Did not a majority petition against it?

MR. TUPPER said he would tell the hon. the Minister of the Interior a little anecdote. When Mr. Howe went to England, a gentleman who had been named that evening in the House and who had formerly been Governor of Nova Scotia, was applied to by Mr. Howe with relation to that question. Mr. Howe said to him: "Here are the petitions." "Well," he answered, "I suppose you have not forgotten when I was Governor of Nova Scotia, and when Mr. Tupper came to me with petitions from the majority of the electors of the Province, asking for a dissolution, and you then told me there was nothing easier than to get up petitions by the hundred and thousand, without much reference to what they contained?" He wanted to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this point, and it was an important one, whether he (Mr. Tupper), with two-thirds of the House of Assembly, elected under universal suffrage, and two-thirds of the Legislative Council at his back, had not as much right to assume that the public sentiment of the Province was not so inimical to that measure, as Mr. Brown and Mr. Mackenzie had to assume that the great Province of Quebec, where they had a very small majority, if any at all, supporting it, was in favour of that measure. The evidences of the hostility to that measure of Union were greater the hour it was carried in Canada, as far as the great Province of Quebec was concerned, than they were in the Province of Nova Scotia. The speech which the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Goudge) had made a few moments previously had brought to his mind a rather peculiar circumstance which he might mention to the House. That

hon. gentleman seemed to think a great crime had been committed in carrying Union in the way it was carried; but it was wonderful how many little reminiscences would crop up. When the constitutionality of his course was challenged, he thought he would take the best means to place the matter before the public. He was then invited to deliver an address at the town of Windsor, the shire town of that hon. gentleman's county. He went up and called the people together, to hear him deliver an address upon this question of Union, and the propriety of passing it without submitting it to the people at the polls.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long ago?

MR. TUPPER said perhaps a year before; but he would not be positive about the date. At all events, when the subject was being agitated after the Quebec Conference, after the matter was arranged and the whole thing was published to the country, and he was told it was purely and simply in question whether he was bound to refer it to the people at the polls, he had argued the matter in the course of a rather long address before the assembled electors of the shire town of the county of Hants.

MR. JONES: Was that before the election or after?

MR. TUPPER said it was before. He argued the whole question at length, and he had great pleasure in acknowledging his thanks to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Goudge), for having been good enough to give him valuable suggestions in reference to what it was best to say to the people in the first instance, and for having, when the election was over—

MR. GOUDGE: Let me make an explanation.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman had better first hear what he had to say, before he made any explanation. It was not to be forgotten that, at the Quebec Conference, they had present four members of the great Reform party of Canada, if he remembered aright, at the Council Board, and every man agreed that it was not only right, but proper, and also their duty, to carry that Act by the existing legislatures.

When he had concluded his address at Windsor, showing why this question should not be referred to the people and why it was strictly right and constitutional for the Legislature to deal with it, the hon. member for Hants moved a vote of thanks, and he believed it passed unanimously. This was the means he had of learning how very hostile the people of Nova Scotia were to that measure. The hon. member for Hants was unmindful of the wise and judicious suggestions of the hon. member for South Waterloo, which commended themselves to the mind of every hon. gentleman in the House, that nothing could more degrade this Legislature than the bringing up of old, stale, and exhausted charges, which had ceased to have any active or operating influence on the public mind. The hon. gentleman could not have heard that statement of the hon. member for South Waterloo, or he would not have read old editorials from the *British Colonist* newspaper, written fifteen years ago, with relation to that or any other subject; but he had read there some strong language which was used in reference to the course Lord Mulgrave had pursued when Governor of Nova Scotia. He must remind the hon. member for Hants that at the time he was using a two-edged sword, for every blow that he struck him (Mr. Tupper) cut the Minister of Militia too. Down to the time that Judge Johnston retired from public life, and long after, he (Mr. Jones) was a staunch Conservative fighting the battle with Judge Johnston and himself; and he was bound to say he (Mr. Tupper) did not now forget the hearty, enthusiastic and vigorous support which that hon. gentleman had given them against the old Reform party of Nova Scotia. Judge Johnston, at the very time that language was used, was leading the party, and Judge Johnston and himself were acting together with the hearty support of the hon. member for Halifax.

MR. JONES: No.

MR. TUPPER: No? Would the hon. gentleman give him a tittle of evidence to show that he (Mr. Jones) ever entertained the slightest difference of opinion with them? None such

MR. TUPPER.

existed, and the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that he took strong ground with Judge Johnston, the then leader of the Opposition, and himself, with relation to the Legislature of Nova Scotia. They had declined Lord Mulgrave's invitation to go, as members of the House of Assembly, to the dockyard to receive His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; but they went there, and were among the first—Judge Johnston and himself—to be presented to and to greet His Royal Highness. They were presented by Lord Mulgrave when His Royal Highness first landed from the flag-ship at the dockyard at Halifax. And not only so, but they had attended the levee given at Government House, and were presented to His Royal Highness again by Lord Mulgrave. They had dined at Lord Mulgrave's table with His Royal Highness, and he had the honour of escorting His Royal Highness to the point where he left the Province, and yet these hon. gentlemen endeavoured to make capital out of that old, worn-out slander by reviving and bringing it up here on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman was made to say in the *Globe*, with the astuteness of the person who revised the speech for him, or through his own correction, when he found that what he had said could not be sustained:

“After referring to Dr. Tupper's misrepresentations with regard to the winter port, the speaker said that the hon. gentleman knew his statement would be looked upon with suspicion.”

This was not what the hon. gentleman had said at all. It was very convenient to leave out what the hon. gentleman had said, and why? Because the statement which the hon. gentleman had made, with reference to the winter port of Halifax, was utterly at variance with the facts, as he would show. But this was not the case with the *Free Press*, which had not the advantage of having this part specially revised by the hon. the Minister of Militia, or some other kind hand, and what did it say? It contained what was omitted from the *Globe's* report, which was this:—

“With regard to the winter port question he said that the hon. gentleman had not

paid as much attention to the affairs of Halifax as he had of late. If he had read the discussion going on in Halifax for the last two years, he must have known that the question of the winter port had been settled long ago."

The hon. gentleman had said that the winter port question was settled long ago; and then he had qualified this a little by saying, did not the hon. gentleman know that the question of the winter port had been settled for the last two months. Enormous use had been made of this question in the late election; and the hon. gentleman would not now be in this House, if it had not been for that issue, otherwise—notwithstanding that other means were used to bring the hon. gentleman here—he was satisfied that the hon. gentleman would have been defeated. When he had made that statement he had been answered by the declaration that this matter had been settled two years ago, and then that it had been settled two months ago. It was said that Mr. Black had returned to Halifax after having had a perfectly satisfactory interview with the First Minister. Now he would like to draw the attention of the House to what had taken place in connection with this matter. When the matter came up for discussion, the merchants of Halifax, irrespective of party, had met and appointed Mr. Black to come up and see Mr. Brydges, the Prime Minister, and other parties, and ascertain whether such arrangements could be made as to cause Halifax to become the winter freight port. Sir Hugh Allan had attended a public meeting at Halifax, where he stated that, if the Government would carry grain for 1s. 3d. per quarter from Rivière du Loup to Halifax, he would give the same rate from Chicago to Liverpool, that he gave *via* Portland, so that the whole question lay in the decision of the Government on this point; and every man able to examine this vital question at all, knew that the issue all hung on the decision of the Government. The merchants named a gentleman to visit the Government and the railway manager and ascertain what were the best terms that could be obtained. They came to Mr. Brydges, and he said it was quite a mistake; they could not carry grain for that figure; Mr. Jones had misun-

derstood him; he (Mr. Brydges) had never said they would do it for 1s. 3d. per quarter; and if he had said so, this would only apply to Canadian produce, and nothing from the United States could be taken at that rate. Then Mr. Black came up with Sir Hugh Allan and had an interview with the hon. the First Minister. What the result was, they might judge when he told the House that both left the hon. the First Minister utterly disappointed. But Mr. Vail was on hand and he learned how the matter stood. He (Mr. Vail) spoke to the hon. the Premier and went back with a message informing Mr. Black that Mr. Mackenzie would like to see him again. Mr. Black then found the hon. the Premier much more practicable, and quite a different man. Mr. Black obtained from the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Mackenzie) a letter which he would read, to show whether this question of a winter freight port was settled two years ago or two months ago. It was not settled the day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was declared elected as member for the county of Halifax. This letter was as follows:—

“OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS,
CANADA,

“OTTAWA, 13th December, 1877.

“DEAR SIR,—Referring to your conversations with me, respecting the possibility of carrying grain over the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup to Halifax, I desire to inform you that the Government have considered the representations made by you on behalf of the Halifax merchants, and will give instructions to the General Superintendent of Government Railways on the subject. I need hardly say that the Government are extremely anxious to do everything to encourage any legitimate business that can be done by the railway. I think it is quite clear, from the data at present available, that the prices you suggested, namely, 1s. 3d. sterling per quarter, or about 3½c. per bushel, over 561 miles of railway, cannot pay running expenses. But directions will be given to afford the necessary facilities for taking, say two cargoes at that rate, after which, both the Halifax merchants and ourselves will be in a position to discuss the matter with realized facts before us.

“Yours faithfully,

“(Signed) “A. MACKENZIE.

“GEO. P. BLACK, Esq.”

MR. MILLS: Is that on the question of the winter port?

MR. TUPPER: Yes. If the hon. gentleman would read the *Morning Chronicle* of Halifax, he would see that nothing was discussed more during the election than this question. This was the principal question which entered into the contest as far as any claims on the part of the Government were concerned. The great argument was this: Vote for Mr. Jones, because the Government is at this moment considering whether the question of the winter port of Canada will be decided against you, for if he is rejected you have no chance whatever of obtaining it. Did any man mean to tell him that the First Minister, with the assistance of Mr. Brydges, one of the ablest men to be found in this or any other country, as far as railway traffic was concerned, and also perhaps better able to tell what wheat grain could be carried for per quarter over 561 miles of railway than any man to be found on this continent, could not have decided this question as well then as now or at any other time? But what did the hon. the First Minister do? He held it over as his trump card which he would not play until he could win the game; and instead of settling the matter then and saying: "I cannot do it; it is impossible; the country cannot afford it"; or instead of saying, what he trusted the hon. gentleman would say, and what he thought the hon. gentleman ought to say: "It is of such vital importance to build up a great Canadian port on Canadian soil with Canadian traffic, that we will do it at this rate; we have got a great public work, and we may as well utilize it"—instead of settling the matter one way or the other, for which he then had just as perfect means as now, he said: "I will carry two cargoes,—that will last over the Halifax election—and then let you know"

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word? Mr. Black asked me to take two cargoes just in that way. This was his own proposition—not mine.

MR. TUPPER said he was quite certain that Mr. Black, who was elected by men of all parties and classes in Halifax to see about this matter, would never

MR. MILLS.

have asked that if he could have got any more. It was perfectly obvious that the matter hung undecided, and, if Mr. Black asked that, it was because it was all he could obtain. And, if this was not using the power of the Crown in the very worst way in order to carry an election, it was difficult to see how this power could be more abused. This question was used actively in the canvass on behalf of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), the Ministerial candidate; and on his election was made to depend the favourable decision of the Government in the matter. Never had there been, in his judgment, a more scandalous abuse of the power of the Crown; nor could this power be used in a worse manner than had been the case in connection with this election.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER said hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but this conferred an enormous advantage on the Ministerial candidate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said Mr. Black came back from Ottawa perfectly satisfied, and so reported to the Board; but he would tell the House what was done. Mr. Black returned and made a report as friendly and favourable as he could; and what was the result? Why, the hon. gentleman, then the Ministerial candidate, induced him (Mr. Black) to hold over the report until the hon. the First Minister could be applied to, in order to obtain something more favourable to settle the election. But he would read what was added to his report afterwards, and they would see what was going on. The hon. gentleman was proving to his constituents the value of having a friend at court. This was held over for two or three days until the hon. the Prime Minister could be again approached, and an arrangement made that would secure the Halifax election:—

“SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT.

“I beg leave to render the following Supplementary Report:—

“That now, as, since my return, your Committee has agreed to raise the funds to pay for the balance of expense of bagging grain; and as a late telegram to me from Mr. Mackenzie has withdrawn all restrictions

that at first encumbered these two experimental trips, and as the necessary cars for said trips will be furnished, thus meeting all the barriers that at one time opposed our enterprise, I have the pleasure of congratulating you on the successful result of your endeavours in making this start, which, I trust, will eventuate in Halifax becoming permanently the Liverpool of the Dominion.

“GEORGE P. BLACK.

“Jan. 15, 1878.”

Now, what did that prove? It proved that there was not enough in the letter to secure the election, and so the telegraph must to be set to work between the candidate and the Prime Minister, in order to get a further concession; and the Prime Minister telegraphed further concessions in order to accomplish this transaction. Yet, this hon. gentleman, with this state of facts standing out here on the page of the history of this country,—this state of admitted facts, proved beyond controversy, by the most undoubted and indisputable testimony,—stood up on the floor of this House and made that statement—that misstatement—that the question was settled long previously, and had nothing to do with this contest. He thought he had disposed of that issue on a question of fact with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman joined issue with him on another question of fact. He stated that one of the monstrous misstatements that he (Mr. Tupper) had made, one of the things that had reduced his majority nearly two thousand—for that was the assertion—was that the present Government, and not the late Government, had removed the workshops from Richmond. The town was placarded all over, “Vote against Dr. Tupper, who took away the workshops from Richmond.” That was one of the trump cards of the hon. gentleman in carrying his election. He stated in the most persistent manner on the platform and in the press, morning, noon and night, that Mr. Tupper and the late Government had removed the workshops from Richmond. He said that he (Mr. Tupper) had promised that, if they would defeat him (Mr. Jones), he would take them back. Now, neither the one statement nor the other was correct; the hon. gentleman was mistaken in both these statements. He said that he (Mr. Tupper) had made the misstatement

that the late Government had not removed the workshops from Richmond. Now, he would prove that they did not remove the workshops from Richmond. The hon. gentleman, in a speech in the Temperance Hall, when he (Mr. Tupper) was a hundred miles away, called upon the electors of Halifax to elect him (Mr. Jones)—the hon. gentleman had nothing to show as a reason why he should continue to represent them, but he called upon them to elect him because he (Mr. Tupper) had taken away the workshops from Richmond. He (Mr. Tupper) therefore felt bound to deal with the question, and when, in a meeting, the question was asked by one of the hon. gentleman's deluded followers: “Why did you remove the workshops from Richmond?” he said, “I cannot answer the question.” “Why not?” “Because I never did remove them; because the late Government did not remove them; because the present Government removed them.”

MR. GOUDGE: Who built the workshops at Moncton?

MR. TUPPER said the workshops at Moncton were an entirely different question. If hon. gentlemen would possess their souls in patience for a few minutes, he would convince them of that fact. His statement was this: he said that Sir George Cartier named Mr. Brydges as one of four Railroad Commissioners charged with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway between Truro and Rivière du Loup. He said that Mr. Brydges, no doubt, from the great knowledge of the subject and the influence that he possessed with his colleagues, satisfied them that they should have a central station from which the Intercolonial road should be operated at Moncton. He (Mr. Tupper) had not acquaintance with this subject enough to controvert any such proposition as that; and the selection of Moncton was made before he was a member of the Government at all. The site was fixed, the place was arranged, and that policy was decided before he ever entered the Government; and the best evidence of that was that, during the past season, the inhabitants of Moncton presented Mr. Brydges with an address in which they thanked him for

having fixed on Moncton as the great central point of the Intercolonial Railway; and Mr. Brydges, instead of saying "You do me too great honour," took the compliment most kindly, and admitted that it was his arrangement, and that he had been able to do it for them. That settled the point of how that came to be chosen as the central station. When Mr. Carvell, who was manager of railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, told him (Mr. Tupper) that he had instructions from Mr. Brydges to take the measurement of the machinery at Halifax, in the workshops, he (Mr. Tupper) told him not to measure a machine at his peril. He said the law confined the Intercolonial Commissioners to the line from Rivière du Loup to Truro; they could do nothing but between these two points without the approval of the Government; they could not put a foot outside of that district, and the policy of the Government was to maintain the repairing shops at Richmond in the future as then, and not a particle of machinery should be taken out of these shops, nor should the work be taken away from them. He would put it to the gentlemen in this House who knew something about railway management whether it was a wise policy or an unwise one that, in a railway of 600 miles in length, the workshops and repairing shops were to be found in one point. He maintained in the interest of the country that the true policy was to maintain repairing shops at Richmond, because it was to be a great terminal station of a great Dominion line of railway; and instead of taking all the machines and all the locomotives that were required for repairs, and the working of 250 miles of railways in Nova Scotia away over the whole of this road to Moncton, the true policy, and the most economical policy, in the interest of the country—while, of course, they required repairing shops at Moncton, for 100 miles of railway from St. John on one side to Shediac on the other, and for the line to Rivière du Loup—was to maintain the workshops at Halifax for the purpose of dealing with the work that required to be done for the lines in Nova Scotia. That was the statement he made; what he did was this—he

Mr. TUPPER.

did not say that, if the hon. gentleman was defeated, they would be brought back; he said the same Government that maintained the policy of keeping the workshops at Richmond would soon be in power again, and when they were in power, the policy they had in the past would be the policy of the present, and the workshops would go back to Richmond. He made no reference to whether the hon. gentleman was elected or whether he was defeated; he stated it as a question of public policy, and stated it in reply to the groundless accusations that had been made that the late Government had been the parties who carried away the shops from Richmond. Now, he would give them evidence that would satisfy the House, and the most credulous member of it,—even the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond,) who could not wait with patience for the explanation—he would undertake to satisfy that hon. gentleman himself, that the statement he made was strictly correct, and that the statement of the hon. the Minister of Militia had not a jot or tittle of foundation in fact. He would read a letter written by W. Johnson, who was locomotive superintendent and machinist at Richmond, while the late Government were in power, and was as able a man in that department as could be found in the country. He would not read Mr. Taylor's letter, although it was confirmatory of the same thing, as his friend the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) knew; he would read, as it was shorter, Mr. Johnson's testimony upon the point:—

“Toronto, Jan. 22nd, 1878.

“HON. DR. TUPPER,—

“MY DEAR SIR,—Your telegram of this date to Mr. G. Taylor, a copy of which was handed to me to read, referring to the removal of machinery and tools from the workshops at Richmond, Halifax, to Moncton. There was no machinery, nor tools, nor any men removed from the workshops while the Sir John A. Macdonald Government was in power in 1873. Nor would there ever have been any, but would have been increased. As a proof of this, the car sheds had been altered and fitted up to receive machinery for working wood, for the purpose of building and repairing cars for the operating the Eastern division of a section of the Intercolonial Railway in Nova

Scotia—250 miles. The machinery in the workshops was sufficient for locomotives' repairs, to operate 250 miles, and I had positive orders from headquarters to allow no machinery or tools to be removed. The pay sheets will prove those facts.

"Yours,

"W. JOHNSTON.

"Late Master Machinist, I.C.R."

He asked the hon. the Minister of Militia if that should not be satisfactory to any member of the House. There was the locomotive superintendent's declaration that nothing was removed. He would give the hon. gentleman further information. The Hon. Mr. McLelan was one of the Commissioners of the Intercolonial Railway; he was the Commissioner representing Nova Scotia. He addressed a letter, over his own signature, to the public papers which he (Mr. Tupper) held in his hand. In this letter, which was dated the 24th of January, 1878, Mr. McLelan said:

"I have only to add, in justice to Dr. Tupper, that when a member of the Government, he repeatedly said to me, as Commissioner of the Intercolonial, that the Richmond workshops should not be removed; that, situated at a terminal point, he believed they should be enlarged, not only in the interests of the road, to meet the growing traffic, but that Nova Scotia might have her fair share of the work.

"I am yours, very truly,

"A. W. McLELAN."

So much for the testimony of Mr. McLelan. If that was not sufficient, he had testimony that he thought would set the matter at rest at once and for ever. The late Government went out of power in November, 1873, and one of the first acts that the hon. the Minister of Public Works did was to commission Mr. Brydges to examine the Intercolonial Railway and report upon its whole condition. He (Mr. Tupper) held the report of Mr. Brydges in his hand, laid upon the table of the House by the Minister of Public Works. What did he tell them? That the workshops had been removed to Moncton? No; he spent two pages of the report in trying to convince the Prime Minister that they ought to be removed. This report was dated the 20th of June, 1874—a long period after the late Government had gone out of power; and he would

quote briefly from page 45 of this document, which was mainly taken up with an elaborate argument to prove to the Minister of Public Works why he should take the workshops away from Richmond and move them to Moncton. He thought that would satisfy his incredulous friend, who began to droop a little already.

MR. DYMOND: I am getting sleepy.

MR. TUPPER proceeded to read from the report of Mr. Brydges. That gentleman, on page 45, used these words:

"There is no necessity of having repair shops at more than one place."

And on page 26:

"The existing repair shop at Richmond, according to my judgment, is unnecessary, and is causing a useless expenditure of money."

He also said:

"The depot at Richmond, in which the repair shop is situated, is of exceedingly small dimensions, and owing to the nature of the ground, consisting of hard rock, it cannot be increased, even at a very extravagant outlay indeed."

On the rate of wages, he said:

"I have gone carefully over the pay sheets at Richmond and at Moncton, and I find that the rate of wages for mechanics actually paid at Moncton is decidedly lower than at Richmond, and the foreman at Richmond told me that his men were complaining and threatening not to remain unless their wages was increased."

He then gave the prices as tendered for material, and said:

"On the whole, therefore, I have no doubt that the cost of working, both as regards the price of the material supplied and the labour employed in working it up, is cheaper at Moncton than at Halifax."

On the same page (47), he said:

"The mechanical superintendent, Mr. Whitney, although at the head of the entire department, has apparently very little, if any, control over what is going on at Richmond and other places. There are practically two superintendents at work."

He trusted that that was a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Hauts (Mr. Goudge) who wanted to know why they built the workshops at Moncton. Mr. Brydges told them they were intended for the purpose of repairing machinery on the road to Newcastle

and up to Rivière du Loup. He trusted that would be satisfactory.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the date of that?

MR. TUPPER said the date was the 20th of June, 1874. The late Government went out in November, 1873. The hon. gentleman could put two and two together. Mr. Brydges said further:

"The existing repair shop at Richmond, according to my judgment, is unnecessary, and is causing a useless expenditure of money."

He wanted to know, if the late Government had removed these workshops, how they could be causing an unnecessary expenditure of money seven months after they went out of power. After sending in this report to the Minister of Public Works, and this urgent appeal to remove the repairing shops from Richmond to Moncton, the hon. the First Minister gave him his instructions, and ordered him to remove them; and in a supplementary report, dated the 18th day of August, 1874, Mr. Brydges said:—

"I will now proceed to state the course which I pursued in carrying out your instructions:—

"The following resignations have been sent in, viz., Wm. McCann, paymaster, whose health has been bad for some time, and who has consequently been anxious to be relieved of his duties. Mr. George Taylor, the late Assistant Superintendent and Freight Agent, whose office has been abolished.

"The following dismissals have taken place in pursuance of your instructions:—

"Mr. Ryan, Cashier.

"Mr. Sadler, General Storekeeper.

"Mr. Clark, Storekeeper, Richmond.

"Mr. Gray, Assistant Engineer.

"Mr. St. George.

"Mr. Wm. Johnstone, Mechanical Superintendent at Richmond.

"Mr. Blanchard, Fuel Agent.

"Mr. Foster, Station Master, Point du Chêne.

"Mr. Foot, Ticket Agent, Richmond.

"Mr. Faulkner, Trackmaster, Truro."

He trusted that that satisfied the House, that the statement he made in Halifax, that he had never removed the workshops, and the late Government never removed them,—that, when they went out of power these shops were in full blast, and doing more work than had ever been done before,—was correct. He now came

MR. TUPPER.

to the last and most important question of all, the issue on the question of fact in relation to the flag, and he thought he would be able to give the House quite as conclusive evidence upon that point as he had given upon the others.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not old.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that, although General Doyle's letter had been in his possession since 1871, he had never used it, because it was of no consequence to him, and it was of no consequence to the country, what opinions the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) held. General Sir Hastings Doyle sent it to him, not as a private letter, but he sent it to him for the purpose of informing his friends at Ottawa, that it might be known. He sent it to him two years after the transaction had happened, because he felt it to be necessary, when the hon. gentleman was coming here, that it should be known. He (Mr. Tupper) differed from General Doyle; he did not think it necessary that it should be known; he was ashamed that it should be known that any man in Nova Scotia had uttered such opinions. But when the militia of this country was handed over to a gentleman who had declared that he would take off his hat and cheer when the flag was pulled down on Citadel Hill; to a gentleman who, according to his own explanation, and the explanation of the ambassador he sent—

MR. JONES: I sent no ambassador.

MR. TUPPER: Sent no ambassador? Did the hon. gentleman mean to tell him that Mr. Vail would have ventured to tell General Doyle what Mr. Jones meant, unless Mr. Jones had authorized him? Would he have used Mr. Jones's name without his authority? But what did the *Globe* report of Mr. Jones's speech say? It said they might judge of the desperation of the hon. gentleman when he had to publish that letter at the last moment in Halifax. He met the hon. gentleman before three thousand of his constituents in the drill-shed and discussed the question out with him. Did he make any allusion to this letter or this question?

Not the least; because the hon. gentleman was seeking to be elected as a private member. But when he found that the gentleman who had been holding such language as he had all the evening to his constituents; who had been exciting and exasperating them against Union with Canada just as bitterly and with as much acrimony as he had done ten years ago; when he found that that gentleman had suddenly changed into a Cabinet Minister, the Minister of Militia in this country, and when he found him giving the lie to the assertion that he had ever made such statements at all as that he would cheer when the flag was hauled down on Citadel Hill, he felt that it was right that the Governor-General of this country should know who was the man that he was making Minister of Militia; and he felt it right that the Parliament should know, and the people of this country should know, into whose hands this office was committed. He was going to put it to the sober, dispassionate judgement, not of gentlemen on his side of the House,—they did not require it,—but he was going to put it to the sober, dispassionate judgment of gentlemen opposite, how this matter stood between the hon. the Minister of Militia and himself. They had, perhaps, heard the story of a culprit arraigned in court for some misdemeanour, and a person on the jury was asked to stand by him. "Now, mind," said he, "stand by me and protect me." "Oh, yes," was the reply, "I will protect you." They found him guilty, and he was sentenced by the Judge. He went to his friend and said, "A pretty way you kept your word; you promised to stand by me, and you found me guilty." "Well," said he, "how could I do anything else? Did you not hear all these witnesses swear, in the most positive manner, that you were guilty? When I found that every man on the jury had not a doubt about it, how could I acquit you; and when the Judge told us there was not the slightest question but what you were guilty?" Says he, "You are a fool; don't you know that all these witnesses were perjured? Don't you know that all those jurymen were prejudiced, and don't you know that that old fool of a judge didn't know what he was talking about?" That was

pretty much the position of the hon. the Minister of Militia. Everybody was a liar but himself; he said General Doyle was lied to; he said that to a body of gentlemen sustaining him on the Treasury benches, when he knew that the man who gave General Doyle his information was a man of the highest standing and credibility in this country. He asked those who heard the hon. gentleman read the speech which was made for him, and which was never uttered—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUPPER said he was speaking of the speech in the newspaper; and he said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) never did utter it. He would prove that to the satisfaction of every member of this House. Those who heard the hon. the Minister of Militia read that speech would look in vain for a word or a sentiment or an illusion in it of the kind that would cause the venerable Judge Johnston to put on his hat and walk out of the room. What did he and Chief Justice Young and Mr. Justice Desbarres, and other citizens of Halifax, leave the room for, if that was the speech he made? Did not every gentleman in the House feel that it was an insult to his understanding to be told that that was the speech? If the speech was made that they said was made, everybody could understand why Judge Johnston and Chief Justice Young and Judge Desbarres, all of them men of high character, should instantly leave the room as they did.—Mr. Vail told the Governor that the hon. gentleman did not say all that he intended to say; why? Because he was put down by hisses and hooting. The hon. gentleman knew, and every man of intelligence knew, that there was not a line, or a sentiment, or a word, in the speech, as given by the hon. gentleman from his newspaper, to account for the action that took place. Let him go to his ambassador, to the person who went to explain away this speech to General Doyle, and ask him to reconcile this speech with the statement he made to General Doyle, that what Mr. Jones said was said in the heat of the moment. Was there any heat in the speech of the hon. gentleman, or anything ex-

citing? Not at all; it was as mild, and as tame, and as quiet as possible. Mr. Vail said that he never intended to say what had been attributed to him; that what he meant to say was that he would cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the Citadel, because then Nova Scotia could fight Canada, and throw off her yoke; and the words he did use were proved to a degree that should satisfy every man of intelligence in this country of the accuracy of the proof. There they had Mr. Vail's statement after this transaction occurred, when there had been ample time for the most thorough ventilation of the whole subject; and they had General Doyle's letter written to himself two years after that. The hon. gentleman stated that General Doyle found that he had been lied to, and was very anxious to have a reconciliation; but he would never make any intelligent man in this country believe that the speech he uttered was any other than these eminent judges had declared it to be, and that his friend Mr. Vail admitted, when long afterwards he was trying to appease the just indignation of the Commander-in-Chief. When General Doyle heard Mr. Vail's explanation, what did he say? All satisfactory? Not at all. General Doyle felt that it was almost as great a crime; that next to the crime of wishing to see the flag hauled down, the next greatest crime that a Canadian could commit was that, after the Union had been accomplished, and it was the interest of every man to bury old troubles, a man could be found in the country to stand up and say he would cheer when the flag was hauled down on the Citadel Hill, because it would enable him to fight Canada and break up this Union. He was not surprised at the spirit manifested by the hon. the Minister of Militia, for it was the same spirit which animated him when seeking election, not as a member of the Cabinet, but as an independent member, to declare that he was ready to do what was in the interests of his constituents, irrespective of the Government, and yet incited the public mind by declaring that the only protection required by Nova Scotia was against Ontario and Quebec, and that, if a barrier was built up between

MR. TUPPER.

them, all would be well. That language, taken in its most qualified sense, was a crime against Canada, and should exclude any gentleman from the Government until he had withdrawn it. Reference had been made to the fact that Sir George Cartier had been a rebel. Many people would, however, be found to justify Sir George Cartier's act in taking up arms. He (Mr. Tupper) was not one of those who did not believe that a man might not be justified in taking up arms against the Government under which he lived, that circumstances might not arise which would warrant a man, not only in using stronger language than the hon. Minister in regard to the British flag, but in taking up arms in support of what he believed to be the interests of the people. But, if Sir George Cartier, in the distant past, did take that position, he had proved to the satisfaction of his Queen, and of the world, that, when justice was done to the people of Canada, no more loyal subject of the Crown, no man more devoted to his country could be found, than the lamented Sir George Cartier, who was ready to shed his blood, if necessary, in defence of Canadian institutions, as we had them to-day. We had now a prosperous, happy and united country, and yet, notwithstanding all that had been done for Nova Scotia, the hon. the Minister of Militia endeavoured to inflame and excite the public mind against the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman had done that for which he was not ashamed, but for which he ought to be ashamed; and any man charged with the high and responsible duty of maintaining and promoting Canadian institutions ought to be ashamed to take into his Cabinet a gentleman who had expressed such opinions and maintained them now. He could not resume his seat without noticing the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax, (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Lévis, (Mr. Fréchette) in respect to Mr. Thibault. He (Mr. Tupper) never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Thibault until the morning of the nomination day in Digby, where he made his acquaintance on the platform. If testimonials went for anything, Mr. Thibault ought to be a respectable man. He was an

alderman of the city of Montreal, he possessed a good standing at the bar, and a certificate as to his qualifications had been signed by the leading barristers in Montreal, where he practised his profession, including not only Mr. Kerr, the Batonnier of the Bar, but the present Minister of Justice. Yet the hon. member for Lévis insulted the hon. the Minister of Justice by declaring that he had put his name to a document, vouching for the character and standing of a man who, if the statements of that hon. member were true, ought to be held to be almost beneath the contempt of any respectable man.

MR. LAFLAMME: Give the date of his certificate.

MR. TUPPER said that Mr. Thibault, whom the hon. the Minister of Justice, in company with Mr. Kerr and all the leading lawyers of Montreal had declared to be a man of high character and standing at the bar, and qualified to perform the duties of Attorney General of the Province of Quebec, was declared by the hon. the member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchet) to be the most notorious scoundrel in Canada. Of Mr. Thibault, he (Mr. Tupper) knew nothing personally, but he could judge somewhat from those evidences of a man's standing and character. He saw Mr. Thibault on a public platform on nomination day at Digby. They went into the largest building that the town afforded, to a meeting, the proceedings of which continued from two to half past nine. Mr. Thibault spoke on that occasion in English, and proved himself to be a man possessing great ability and an acquaintance with public affairs that would do credit to the hon. member for Lévis. That hon. member had read an extract from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*. He could not prove that the hon. member had anything to do with that sheet, but it was a curious circumstance that it appeared the morning after the hon. member's arrival from Digby. He (Mr. Tupper) was satisfied that the report of the speech was false. He knew that the Rev. Dr. Walsh, one of the most worthy members of the Catholic clergy of the Province, was present, and that, if any such utterances had

been made, he would have denounced Mr. Thibault as unworthy of belief. He therefore advised Mr. Thibault to write to Dr. Walsh, and ask him to state whether such a speech was made. He (Mr. Tupper) had not seen Dr. Walsh's reply, but the hon. the member for Hochelaga had done so; it was there denied that such a speech had been made. Such was the miserable lying slander that the hon. the member for Lévis thought it not beneath his position to bring before the House, in respect to an absent man. From a report in the *Quebec Chronicle*, it appeared that there had been a meeting of the Quebec bar called yesterday to pass resolutions expressive of their deep regret at the death of His Holiness the Pope, and the first resolution was moved by Mr. C. S. Chevrier, one of the most respectable members at the bar, belonging to the Liberal party, and seconded by Mr. Charles Thibault. The solution of the difficulty respecting the published speech was not that the hon. member for Lévis wrote it, but that it was probably a translation of Mr. Thibault's French speech by Mr. Vail. He was glad, however, to know that the election in Digby was not carried by any of those monstrous misstatements. The hon. the Minister of Militia had stated that, when he (Mr. Tupper) returned to Halifax, he had said that Mr. Vail would be elected, and said he had the proof. He defied the hon. gentleman to prove it. In the presence of Mr. Wade and his committee, after he went with them over the information from all the English sections of the county, he arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Vail's defeat was certain. He met Mr. Vail on the street, in the presence of Mr. Oakes, formerly a member of this House, and now a member of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, and said to him, "You are a badly-beaten man." Mr. Vail replied: "I will not only double my majority, but will probably treble it." He (Mr. Tupper) said that, from what he knew, Mr. Vail would not only have no majority, but would be badly beaten. He (Mr. Tupper) returned to Halifax and, before a large number of his friends, stated that, while he had not seen the returns from the French dis-

tricts, he had seen those from the English sections, and from what he knew of the temper of the people he was satisfied that Mr. Vail was badly beaten, so far as the English vote was concerned, or he knew nothing of elections. There was a gentleman, now within hearing of his voice, present when he made that statement on his return to Halifax. Mr. Vail, at that election, was defeated by nearly 400 votes, which was mainly due to the English vote.

MR. MILLS: Who misled the *Mail* and *Citizen*?

MR. TUPPER said he sent no communications to either of those journals respecting the Halifax or Digby elections. He did not go into the streets and proclaim Mr. Vail's probable defeat, because he well knew the great efforts that would be made by the Government under such circumstances, to carry the election. His son, residing at Toronto, telegraphed him asking what were the prospects in Halifax. In reply, he thought it the best policy to use the motto of the Duke of Devonshire, and he telegraphed "Cavendo tutus," and thought he would leave the telegraph operator to make what he pleased of it. Those explanations were due to himself in regard to matters of fact. The hon. the Minister of Militia, had referred to him in the most unhandsome terms. He did not object to the hon. gentleman joining issue with him as to matters of fact, but nothing could be more infamous and dastardly and more calculated to lower the dignity of this House, than general charges of misstatement without there being any foundation for them. He had shown how far he was open to such a charge at the hands of the hon. gentleman, and he defied him to controvert the statements now made by him (Mr. Tupper), and supported by convincing evidence.

MR. DYMOND: Before I claim the indulgence of the House for a moment in regard to a personal matter, I would ask whether, in alluding to a member of the House, whom the hon. gentleman supposed to have garbled or revised his speech, he alluded to me?

MR. TUPPER: I did not quite say so. I said the hon. gentleman was

MR. TUPPER.

known to be closely connected with the *Globe* newspaper, and no hon. gentleman had a closer perception than he of the fact that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was floating through blunders and mistakes. I do not know what the hon. gentleman did, but I thought he did not discharge what he considers his duty to his party unless he would just suggest to the reporter that it would be well to have the speech revised before publication. While the speech I made appeared in the *Globe* of the next morning, the same compliment was not paid to the hon. the Minister of Militia, and those who know the enterprise of that newspaper can imagine the reason.

MR. DYMOND: Then it was to me that the hon. gentleman referred? Do I understand that the hon. gentleman referred to me?

MR. TUPPER: I have given the hon. gentleman his answer. I do not want to make any personal or offensive reference.

MR. DYMOND: I appeal to the House whether, through a large portion of his speech, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) did not insinuate that a certain member of this House did advise or control the reporters of the *Globe* newspaper, and that, by that member's influence, a report of that speech had been curtailed or garbled. No man of sense could draw any other conclusion from the speech of the hon. gentleman. But, when I challenged him, he did what he is in the habit of doing up and down the country—he did not repeat the accusation, but gave a milder statement, in order that he might have a means of escaping from the consequence of his previous allegations. It is an old game of the hon. gentleman; I know him well in that respect, and have only too often had to follow him, in regard to it, with both pen and voice. I rise to give to the House the most unequivocal denial of the statement, that I have in this case or any other case, in the slightest degree, interfered with the reporters of the *Globe*.

MR. TUPPER: I say frankly, and at once, that I did suspect the hon.

gentleman, and I accept his denial in the fullest sense.

MR. DYMOND: I am sure the hon. gentleman will say so, because, though we have been political opponents ever since I first trod Canadian soil, I have never intentionally done him an injustice, nor has any personal feeling ever intruded itself with our relations to each other. Though I deeply regret to allude to a matter of this personal nature, I feel bound to say that I have no more to do with the duties of reporters of the *Globe* than the hon. member for Cumberland. My hon. friends around me have frequently, and very naturally, come to me to ask me to see that a correct report appeared of some one or other of their speeches, but I have invariably told them that I have nothing to do with the matter. The *Globe* reporters are as independent as any hon. member of this House. I never knew a reporter of the paper with which I was connected before I came to this country, who would listen to a suggestion that he should garble the report of anybody's speech, and I can say the same with reference to the *Globe*. It is an insult to the press to suggest anything else. I say in all courtesy and kindness that I hope the hon. gentleman, in future, will be more careful of the character of his fellow-members in this House. The charge made, or insinuated, is very serious; for the garbling of the speech of a member of Parliament would be a gross breach of the privileges of Parliament, for which anyone who was guilty of it should be called to the bar of this House, and, if a member, be expelled. If the hon. gentleman could have proved his charge, I would resign my seat within five minutes, and shrink away from the sight of my fellow-men. However earnestly I may feel in regard to political questions, I hope the hon. gentleman will always find me a fair opponent, willing to give blow for blow, but never guilty of a dishonourable action. I thank the hon. gentleman for having acquitted me of the act he imputed to me, and I hope I shall never again have occasion to allude to my connection with the *Globe* newspaper on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. JONES said he regretted that, at this early hour of the morning, he had to allude to the observations of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). It was evident that the observations he (Mr. Jones) had addressed to the House on a previous occasion, had gone home to the hon. gentleman. It was evident, from the tone of the hon. gentleman to-night, that he felt, perhaps for the first time, that the record of his past public life had been held up and exposed to the people of Canada, that a point had been touched in his past political career, that exposures had been made and matters had come to light affecting him, during the time he was a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, which, coming before the people of Canada, would convey to them all the information which was necessary to enable them to arrive at a just estimation of the hon. gentleman's public career. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Jones) had indulged in old and stale charges. Did not the hon. member for Cumberland commence on the floor of this House by introducing matters which had been explained before his (Mr. Jones's) own electors time and again—a subject which had been explained, and the explanation accepted by every fair-minded man? But the hon. gentleman had not thought it beneath him to bring up that old story and try to make political capital against him on the ground of his becoming a member of this Government. The hon. gentlemen had said that he had no right to join a Government with which he had such a difference of opinion. He commenced on the sugar question. He (Mr. Jones) stated frankly then that he did differ from the Government on a question of trade. Did the hon. gentleman or any hon. member, suppose that all the members of the Government were agreed on the great question of trade and finance; that all men's minds were cast in one mould; or that what appeared to one Minister plain, was presented in the same light to all his colleagues? This could not be the case. If it was necessary, all independent thought would be stifled by such slavery. There

was no sacrifice of principle in connection with this question. Moreover, this question had changed very much since it was before the House on a previous occasion. He understood very well the object of the hon. gentleman in bringing this matter before the House. The hon. gentleman wanted to make and show himself the champion of Halifax interests. He (Mr. Tupper) was endeavouring to show the people of Halifax that he (Mr. Jones) had disregarded their interests in that respect, and that he was the only champion of their views on this occasion. But the hon. gentleman knew very well that this question had changed very much, and the settlement of it was in the future. Very much, in this relation, depended upon the legislation that took place on this subject in the neighbouring country. But what had the hon. gentleman done when his colleagues differed with him (Mr. Tupper), respecting the National Policy? Was it not well known to the country that his colleagues had not agreed with him (Mr. Tupper) on that point, the great National Policy?—and yet they had not seen the hon. gentleman sever his connection with that Cabinet.

MR. TUPPER: No.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman says "No."

MR. TUPPER: I was not a member of the Cabinet when it was carried.

MR. DYMOND: When it was voted down?

MR. JONES: When it was repealed?

MR. TUPPER: No.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman knows well enough.

MR. TUPPER: Will the hon. gentlemen allow me to make a statement? When the National Policy was carried I was not in the Cabinet; but, when I was in the Cabinet, every member of it united to resist the repeal of the duties, and we stood together, every man of us.

MR. JONES: Every member of the Cabinet was united on that question?

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

MR. JONES.

MR. JONES: Regarding the repeal of the duties, every member of the Cabinet joined in voting it down.

MR. TUPPER: No; we did not.

MR. JONES said the hon. gentleman had brought up the question of the flag, and had endeavoured to give a new turn to it. In the statements made the other night, the hon. gentleman had sought to show to the House that Mr. Vail and others had a year or two afterwards, owing to statements of his (Mr. Jones), had gone to General Doyle to make certain explanations concerning this matter. But he (Mr. Jones) would say here that, if Mr. Vail had ever so said anything on the subject, he did so on his own account, and was no representative or ambassador from him (Mr. Jones). He had never asked Mr. Vail, or anybody else, to convey to General Doyle any expression with regard to the speech which he had made on that occasion. He had read this speech the other night, and the hon. gentleman had not thought it beneath him to say it was not the speech which he (Mr. Jones) had delivered on that occasion. He would ask the hon. gentleman what authority he had for making this statement. How did the hon. gentleman know that this was not the speech in question? Was the hon. gentleman then present? Did the hon. gentleman know anything about it? He would tell the hon. gentleman that General Doyle only got his information concerning this matter second-hand. General Doyle had not heard that speech; he had obtained his information from Sir William Young, and, as he had stated the other night, so he now repeated, Sir William Young was a political partizan, and had been so ever since the question of Union up to the present time. The hon. gentleman spoke of Judge Johnston and others leaving the room at that time. He would tell the hon. gentleman what took place. There was a meeting of citizens to give a dinner to Sir John Young, and those gentlemen had come there thinking that they would overawe the citizens of Halifax, and prevent a free expression of opinion. They came there, as he had stated in his speech on that occasion, to over-

awe the citizens by their presence as Judges of the Court, and interfere with a free expression of views upon that question. But he was not going to be over-awed by Chief Justice Young, or by any other man—nay, not even by the hon. member for Cumberland himself, and he had spoken then, as now, his honest sentiments. The speech he then delivered was fairly, honestly, and correctly reported; he had had nothing to take back concerning what he had then said, and he had nothing to take back now. He would ask the hon. gentleman why he (Mr. Tupper) had not used that letter when General Doyle was in the country? He (Mr. Tupper) had had that letter in his pocket since 1872, and he dared not use it when General Doyle was in this country after the reconciliation he (Mr. Jones) had mentioned had taken place, because he (Mr. Tupper) knew that General Doyle would, under such circumstance, have at once come down with the frankness which had always characterized him, and explained the whole position of affairs. No; the hon. gentleman had waited until General Doyle was out of the country and until the late election was embittered by his presence; in fact, until the last moment, when he (Mr. Tupper) thought that by publishing it he would injure a political opponent and had then taken upon himself the responsibility which he was happy to believe no other man in this Parliament,—nay, no honourable man in this country,—would have done, of publishing the letter of an absent man to injure a political opponent in an election. He would repeat there—and he was sure that he would be justified by the result—that, when General Doyle came to know what base use the hon. gentleman had made of that letter at that critical moment, no one would be more indignant than the General with reference to the use made of it by the hon. member for Cumberland. He had nothing more to say on this point, save this, that the hon. gentleman and his friends on the other side of the House, in spite of all the explanations which he (Mr. Jones) had made on the subject, went on repeating the old story. They thought that the lie would stick somewhere, and that it would reach

some point where it would do harm. He was amazed to hear the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) — but he was not amazed in this connection at the hon. member from North Hastings, because he could not be amazed by anything that came from this hon. gentleman—and other hon. gentlemen opposite who, he knew in social life would frown down such an impropriety, repeat that old story over again as if it was an accepted fact, instead of being a foul slander. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Jones) would not meet him at Mr. Richey's meeting. The hon. gentleman knew very well how that arose. Before he (Mr. Jones) knew he (Mr. Tupper) was coming at all, he had addressed a note to his opponent, saying that he would like to have a public meeting and discuss public matters regarding the county. Mr. Richey had not accepted at the moment, and at a meeting of Mr. Richey's friends that night, it was announced that Mr. Tupper was coming down to take part in the meeting. He (Mr. Jones) had then said to Mr. Richey that this meeting was to be between themselves, to show to the people of Halifax why the Government of the day should or should not be sustained; and he wrote a note which was published, saying that when Dr. Tupper arrived he would be only too happy to discuss Dominion matters generally with him (Mr. Tupper). On his return from Digby he was willing to meet the hon. gentleman, and had appointed the earliest day at his disposal for this purpose; the meeting had taken place in the drill-shed, and it had not ended, he thought, to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Tupper) had alluded again to the house in Hollis-street, and had endeavoured to cover up that transaction, by stating that he could explain it away if only afforded the opportunity. The hon. gentleman might explain it as he liked; but he would tell the hon. gentleman that high judicial Courts had looked with great suspicion on transfers of property between relatives which fitted conveniently into political occasions. The hon. gentleman might bring forward what evi-

dence he liked as to the transfer of the house to his son, but every honest man in this Parliament and country would believe that the whole scheme was planned by the hon. gentleman in order that his son might have the advantage of letting that property to the Government, and that, through his son, he might reap the benefit of the income from it. The hon. gentleman said that the house was let for no more than it had been leased for on previous occasions: this he would not dispute; it was immaterial; he did not care whether it was then let for more or less than previously. The hon. gentleman said that this house was subsequently sold for something like \$9,000; but did the hon. gentleman say what amount the Government had spent in improving this property when it was let to the Government? He ventured to say that the amount which the Government had expended on it had increased its value very much, and he supposed that this sum could be obtained by reference to the Departments. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Government at the time. Who had negotiated this transaction with Mr. Carvell? Did the hon. gentleman do it, or did the hon. gentleman tell his son to do it? No evidence was apparent concerning any correspondence having passed between the hon. gentleman's son and Mr. Carvell. There was simply sent a letter from Mr. Stewart Tupper enclosing the lease to the Government for three years. Who conducted that negotiation? Who arranged the basis of the lease? The hon. gentleman himself must have done it, or else some correspondence would have passed between Mr. Stewart Tupper and Mr. Carvell. This might yet come to light. The hon. gentleman might explain the matter as he liked, and might prove what he liked; but he (Mr. Jones) would repeat that, in the minds of all honourable men, the hon. gentleman could never escape from the suspicion which attached to him of having placed his son in a position to reap an advantage from the Government which he (Mr. Tupper) could not obtain in the position in which he then stood. The hon. gentleman said that the *Globe*, reporters or himself had garbled his (Mr.

Jones's) speech. He (Mr. Jones) had certainly nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Jones) had been inconsistent in the course of his speech the other evening, in stating in the early part of it that the misrepresentations which he (Mr. Tupper) had made during the late contest in some parts of the country where they could not reach him, had misled the public mind, and that, if it had not been for this his majority would have been larger; and then he said he (Mr. Jones) gave him (Mr. Tupper) credit for having increased it. His speech was perfectly consistent, as he had said that, in one part of the county visited by the hon. gentleman, his (Mr. Jones's) majority was increased. He did not think that there was anything inconsistent in these two statements; at all events, he could not perceive it. If it was the case, surely the hon. gentleman could not complain. The other day the hon. gentleman's organ in Montreal, the *Gazette*, had entirely held back the reply of the hon. the Postmaster-General to the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell). There had been one course of misrepresentation by the hon. gentleman's press throughout the last three or four years, of the views which hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House had placed before Parliament. He had been amused at the hon. gentleman referring to the observation which he (Mr. Jones) had made last year regarding the Pacific Railway. If he judged him (Mr. Tupper) by his own organ, the hon. gentleman would find that he (Mr. Jones) was in perfect accord with the views of the present Government on this point, on which the hon. gentleman thought that he differed with them, because he believed that the *Montreal Gazette* had on that occasion made him (Mr. Jones) say that the only fault he had to find with the Government was in not having gone on with that railway and built it at once. The hon. gentleman had no doubt felt the force of the remarks which he (Mr. Jones) had made the other day respecting the auditor here; and he (Mr. Tupper) thought that the reference in that speech would afford him the oppor-

MR. JONES.

tunity of backing down. The hon. gentleman had said in a public place that all a Minister of the Crown had to do when an account of his own or of his friends was to be passed, was to touch the auditor on the shoulder, and say: "I am interested in this," or "My friend is interested in this," and it would be all right. He (Mr. Jones) had asked him then, and he repeated it now—whether this was the way in which he (Mr. Tupper) had passed the Fraser-Reynolds account; and was this the way in which the right hon. member for Kingston had drawn \$6,000 of Secret Service money, after he had ceased to be a member of the Government? They knew that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had touched the auditor on the shoulder, and the hon. member for Cumberland, perhaps, had some of the right hon. gentleman's experience in the transaction. The hon. gentleman said he had never taken public money. He (Mr. Jones) had given him Mr. Archibald's opinion on this point the other night, and the hon. gentleman had felt the full force of it; and the tone of the hon. gentleman's observations that night evidently showed that he had felt the full force and damaging character of it still. The hon. gentleman had never taken public money, indeed! They would see what Mr. Archibald had said further on that occasion. Mr. Archibald, while criticising in the same speech the course pursued by the hon. gentleman, said:—

"These two gentlemen were like the two heads of the Fenian faction, meditating a raid on the public treasury, and the only strife between them was which should be the first to pocket the plunder."

That was another certificate of character from the Governor of Nova Scotia. When the hon. gentleman found that suspicion had passed into conviction in the public mind—when the hon. member found that Mr. Archibald's letter in reply to his supplication for a certificate of character had only deepened that conviction—then the hon. gentleman tried to turn round and explain it in the way he had done to-night, and throw suspicion on Mr. Fleming. He (Mr. Jones) said then, and he said now, that he did not refer to Mr. Fleming at all. As there was

no one other gentleman mentioned in connection with it, the hon. gentleman could make the application. Never took public money? Why, wherever there was public money going, he would venture to say the hon. gentleman had a full share of it during the time he was in public life. He might repeat a story, as the hon. gentleman was fond of telling stories. At the time of the Pacific scandal, there was an old farmer from Cumberland who met a friend in the railway, and he said to him with reference to public matter: "I am a supporter of Mackenzie's Administration; I believe they are able and pure men; I believe they are honestly and economically conducting the affairs of the country; but, for all that, I do not believe in the Pacific scandal." "Don't believe in the Pacific scandal! Why not?" "Why," he replied, "it has been said that there was \$350,000 of money floating about at the time of sale of the Pacific charter. It has been said, under the signature of Sir George Cartier, that money was given for the elections, \$10,000 here, \$20,000 there, and \$30,000 in another place; and a last \$10,000 for the last time to the right hon. member for Kingston himself, but it has never been proved that Mr. Tupper got one cent of it; and," he added, "from what I know of the antecedents of that hon. gentleman,—I was raised in the same country with him—I know very well that, if that large sum of money had been going, Mr. Tupper got his full share of it." And that was the reason why the old farmer did not believe in the Pacific Scandal. The hon. gentleman had endeavoured to explain away his connection with the Springhill mines. He need not explain them away; he could no more explain that transaction than he could the Pictou road. The Government of which he was the leader passed an Order in Council, which, three days subsequently, was printed in the *Royal Gazette*. The *Royal Gazette* was printed usually on Wednesday, and generally reached the public offices on Thursday morning. Mr. Charles H. M. Black appeared at the offices with an application for all those coal areas, with all their metes and bounds described accurately; and, when the

Commissioner of Mines expressed his astonishment and said it was illegal, then he gave him the *Royal Gazette* containing the Order in Council. It had been passed three or four days previously but not made public; and the Commissioner was obliged to give him the property. The hon. gentleman said he had no connection with it. He (Mr. Jones) repeated here what he had said elsewhere on a previous occasion, when he drew from the hon. gentleman an unguarded admission, that out of that transaction he had made \$40,000. The hon. gentleman was intimately associated with Mr. Black; he was his political and personal friend; and every man in Halifax knew that, when Mr. Black moved in that transaction, he moved for the hon. member and the ring with which he was connected. When that subject was before the House, Mr. Black might write as many letters as he pleased; he might say he never got that information direct from the hon. gentleman, because he (Mr. Jones) knew, from his experience with this house in Hollis-street, how well the hon. gentleman could cover up his tracks. He said he never got that information from the hon. gentleman himself, but they knew very well that the hon. gentleman had other means of informing Mr. Black of this transaction. It was not necessary that he himself—he took good care that he would not himself—but he must have taken good care that Mr. Black was aware of it, and Mr. Black acted on the suggestion which was so kindly put in his way; and the hon. gentleman, as the result of that transaction, pocketed \$40,000. The hon. gentleman said it was a subject of investigation. That was perfectly true. But where was Mr. Black on that occasion? When the character of his friend was aspersed, when the reputation of the hon. gentleman was at stake, when the suspicion of the public mind was so deep that every man believed what was said with regard to this transaction and his connection with it, one would have imagined that, if Mr. Black had been his friend, as he described him to be, he would have taken advantage of the earliest opportunity, that he would have come forward willingly, let alone being sum-

MR. JONES.

moned, that he would have come before that committee in order to exonerate under oath the hon. gentleman from all connection with that transaction. Did he do so? Not at all. He kept out of the way; he would not attend that committee; and he only made the suspicion deeper in the public mind, because every one knew that, if Mr. Black had one word to say in favour of the hon. gentleman, he would have been only too glad to have come there to give him the benefit of his testimony. The hon. gentleman had again referred to the old question of Union, and had endeavoured to shelter himself behind the actions of men in Ontario and elsewhere, of gentlemen who led public opinion in Ontario and elsewhere. But that did not relieve the hon. member from the position in which he (Mr. Jones) placed him. The hon. member was the head of the Government that was elected in 1863, without any reference to the question of Union at all. The hon. gentleman took upon himself to send a delegation to Prince Edward Island to meet a delegation from Canada, and subsequently that delegation met in Quebec; and at Quebec was originated the first scheme of Union. When the hon. gentleman brought that scheme back to Nova Scotia, there was such an outburst of indignation against the measure that the hon. gentleman was obliged at once to withdraw it. A second scheme was formed in 1865 and 1866; and, from the day that that scheme was mooted up to the time that it was so improperly passed by the Local Legislature, there was one feeling of opposition from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, and the floors of Parliament were flooded with petitions against the passage of the Act without appealing to the people. The hon. gentleman need draw no consolation from the action of hon. gentlemen in Ontario and Quebec. These hon. gentlemen understood the position; they understood the wants, and they were supposed to understand the feelings, of their own people; but, whether they were right or wrong, it was no excuse to the hon. gentleman for having taken an unwarrantable advantage, for having taken an unwarrantable liberty with the people of Nova Scotia—for having changed

the constitution of that country, which was equal to a revolution, and denied the people the opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it until the act was consummated. The hon. gentleman said he passed it by a large majority in the House. He (Mr. Jones) was not going to say here, to-night, how that measure was carried. It was known that a large number of gentlemen, who were originally opposed to it, under the management of the hon. gentleman, by seats in the Senate, by seats in the Legislative Council, through means which he knew so well how to employ when they were at his disposal, converted a minority into a majority on that question in the House. It would stand as a lasting disgrace to him as a public man that, on that question of Union, he denied the people of Nova Scotia the right of speaking on their own behalf. He might endeavour to make what explanation he liked with regard to his lectures; he might have his opinion upon that or any other subject; but he had no authority from the people of Nova Scotia—he was never delegated with power from the people of Nova Scotia to make such a radical change in their constitution without first asking the authority of the people from whom that authority was derived. The hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Jones) was a supporter of his at the time he (Mr. Tupper) refused to go to the dockyard to meet the Prince of Wales. He denied it entirely. At the time the hon. gentleman referred to, he (Mr. Jones) took no interest in politics at all. It was not till 1863, when Mr. Howe, as he thought very improperly, held his position in the Government after he had been appointed Fishery Commissioner, and endeavoured to throw the shield of his popularity over Mr. Archibald and Mr. Wire, and other members who were then leading the Government, that he took an active part for the first time in public matters in Nova Scotia. He did not even know the hon. gentleman. He remembered well the day the hon. gentleman came and saw him in his office, on the dissolution of 1863 taking place, three years after the Prince of Wales visited Halifax; and the hon. gentleman would remember, if he called

to his remembrance the circumstance, that he (Mr. Tupper) came and introduced himself to him in his office, the first time he had ever seen him. He was no follower of the hon. gentleman's, and no colleague of his. When he heard that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had refused to attend the reception of the Prince of Wales, he (Mr. Jones) was as indignant as any one, and it was owing to the pressure of the party outside, through Mr. Johnston, who desired that the hon. gentleman should attend, that he was ultimately compelled to yield to the wishes of his party and meet the Prince at Halifax dockyard on that occasion. He might have been one of the first to receive the Prince, but he was one of the last to consent to receive him; and it was perfectly consistent with the career of the hon. gentleman that, having once taken the step, he would go forward and follow His Royal Highness through Nova Scotia as long as His Royal Highness would permit him. The hon. member for Cumberland had referred to the question of the winter port. When speaking on that point the other night he (Mr. Jones) said the question of the winter port was settled almost twelve months ago; and it was not before the public as a new question at the time of his last election.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. JONES said that, when in 1876 the Intercolonial was completed, the Government took the earliest opportunity to direct the mails to be landed at Halifax, which was thus recognized as the winter port of the Dominion. Last winter the mails going to and coming from England were received at and departed from Halifax.

MR. MACKENZIE: And freight.

MR. JONES said the hon. member for Cumberland had alleged that they had sent Mr. Black to the Government. They never did so, and they now found that Mr. Black was playing his own little game. He (Mr. Jones) nominated Mr. Black to proceed to the west and visit the brokers and merchants of the country, and show them that the route by Halifax was the cheapest route to Europe. Afterwards, Mr. Black visited Ottawa, in company with Sir Hugh Allan, and brought to Halifax a letter

from Mr. Mackenzie of the most satisfactory character. There was no talk of the winter port question at the time he (Mr. Jones) vacated his seat. That question was one in which the public generally were interested. The Chamber of Commerce, City Council and Importers' Association sent Mr. Black, and on returning to Halifax he informed the committee which had appointed him that the Government had met him fairly on every question. Mr. Mackenzie had given him a letter, stating that the Government would put forth every effort to make Halifax the winter port. Mr. Black subsequently stated that Mr. Mackenzie had inserted a restriction that grain should not come from Chicago. He (Mr. Jones) said that such was quite impossible, that Mr. Mackenzie in his letter laid down no such restriction, and he thereupon sent a telegram to Mr. Mackenzie: "Did you intend any restrictions with Black, or is your letter to be read as you put it." Mr. Mackenzie replied: "I never mentioned to Black any restrictions whatever? I do not care where the grain comes from, as you can see by the letter I gave him on that occasion." That was the whole history. The hon. member for Cumberland declared that he had never threatened Halifax, or brought any improper influence to bear on the electors of Halifax, such as he had charged him (Mr. Jones) with using. At the time of the general election at which he (Mr. Jones) was defeated, the hon. member for Cumberland addressed a letter to the people of Halifax on July 19th, 1872. The hon. member for Cumberland, on the question of the Intercolonial Railway workshops, had made a distinct bribe to the people of Halifax to reject him (Mr. Jones), because in rejecting him they might inflict a blow on the Government and bring the hon. member for Cumberland back to power, thereby leading to the re-establishment of the workshops at Halifax. The hon. gentleman knew he was stating what was untrue in regard to not having used improper influence, for, at a meeting in the Temperance Hall in 1875, that hon. member, when driven to the last extremity of using all influence, proper or improper, made use of a bribe to defeat him (Mr. Jones)

MR. JONES.

and bring the hon. member for Cumberland back to office, by pledging himself that he would bring the Intercolonial Railway works back to Halifax if he ever regained power. The hon. gentleman had adduced the evidence of Mr. Taylor and Mr. Johnson, which would be rightly estimated where he mentioned that those gentlemen were at the head of the workshops, under the *régime* of the hon. member for Cumberland, and when the famous frauds in connection with Fraser, Reynolds and Company took place, and when the present Government came into office Johnson, the head of the machine shop, was dismissed, and Taylor was placed in a lower position, which he would not accept, and left. The first thing the Government did in 1874, when there were some locomotives being constructed at Halifax, which Mr. Montgomery could not finish, was to complete those to which Mr. Appleton referred, and from that hour to this there had been as many men employed and as much work done as at any previous time. The hon. member for Cumberland had asserted that the workshops were removed from Halifax by the present Government. In the Public Works Department would be found a memorial addressed by his (Mr. Jones's) colleague and himself to the Department when they came to the House in 1874, asking the hon. Minister to bring back to Halifax the workshops. He remembered addressing a meeting in Richmond, and stating that he did not think it was possible to remove the workshops to Richmond, because the Government had incurred a large expenditure at Moncton. He stated, however, that the Government would use all proper and legitimate influence in that direction, but he did not think the removal could be effected. When addressing an audience the other day, a man stood up and said: "I remember your speech respecting workshops. You did not make the promises Mr. Tupper made; I believe you now. I don't believe the promises of that hon. gentleman, because it was only at the last moment, when he thought he would injure you, that he fell back on the promise to re-establish the shops at Halifax, when he has no intention to carry them back." Another election

card was a letter sent by the right hon. member for Kingston to his friend the member for Cumberland, in the following terms:—

"I feel a personal interest in this matter, as being responsible with my colleagues for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and its location—for which I was so heartily abused. I am, therefore, naturally anxious to see that railway a success financially and otherwise; and that can only be secured by directing as large a volume of traffic as possible towards and over it, and thus developing and extending the trade of its great terminus at Halifax. I hope the Government won't be blind to this great object, and that they may be induced to make an extra effort for the purpose. If they do not they will fail of their duty, and will be reminded of their failure at the next general elections."

That letter was no doubt written for the occasion, because it never saw the light of day until it was printed in the hon. gentleman's organ on the 28th January, one day before the Halifax election. Yet, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, it might be imagined that he would scorn any attempt to change the opinions of the electors of Halifax by any such influences. Nevertheless, it appeared from his own organ that he not only made promises publicly and through the press, but, at the last moment before the Halifax election, published a letter from the right hon. member for Kingston, stating that the Government would be derelict in their duty if they did not do everything in their power to develop and extend the trade of the great terminus of Halifax. The House would now be in a position to judge as to what value should be placed on the evidence which the hon. member for Cumberland had quoted on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman had stated that those were old stale charges, and that he (Mr. Jones) had made the charge of mis-stating facts against him and had not proved it. He had not made a single statement in support of which he could not bring ample and sufficient proof. When he referred to that fact, he gave the proofs to the House. Were not Mr. Archibald's letters sufficient proof to the House to force conviction on every fair-minded man? But, when Mr. Archibald was applied to by the hon. gentleman for a certificate of

character, he wrote one of the most guarded letters that any man could commit to paper. It might be supposed that he would say: "I did not mean, and I did not say, anything of the kind." He had the opportunity to do that when the hon. gentleman wrote him that note, because they were friends—an opportunity to say that not only he did not say so, but that he did not believe it then, and he did not believe it now. Did Mr. Archibald say anything of the kind? No; he said: "If you will refer to my speech which was delivered on that occasion you will find that I did not make such a charge." He (Mr. Jones) thought a great many things occurred in public matters which were similar to trials in the old country in criminal matters, and were said to be "not proven." But the same conviction rested on the public mind that the man accused in such cases was guilty as if the verdict of guilty had been brought in against him. The hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Jones) had brought these old stale charges against him; they were not old stale charges in that House at all events; and it was because the hon. gentleman felt that there were true charges, and that they would go throughout the country and stamp him as an unreliable public man, that he had shown so much temper that evening and on previous occasions. If he thought to cow him (Mr. Jones) by such charges as he had made, he had mistaken his man. He was not afraid to meet the hon. gentleman in open discussion, and whatever public record they might have he was willing to discuss in this House or, as he had discussed it lately, before the electors of Halifax, who had given him their verdict. When the hon. gentleman was in Halifax the other day, he (Mr. Jones) referred to some of those matters—to some of them only because they were well understood there—but in this House it was because hon. members were not aware of these matters that it was in the interest of good Government that the public should be made aware of the previous character of the hon. gentleman who was seeking to hold a prominent position in this country in the future. It would be an unfortunate day for the

people of Canada if the hon. gentleman should ever be placed in an uncontrollable position. It was a fortunate thing that the Government had introduced a Bill to appoint a public auditor who should be beyond the control of Parliament, because if such a misfortune should happen, at any future time, that the hon. gentleman should be associated with the Government of the country, he would not be able to carry out the practice, which he himself had insinuated that he carried out before, of touching the auditor on the shoulder and asking him to pass his own accounts or the accounts of friends in whom he was interested. He (Mr. Jones) was unwilling to bring these matters before the House, but he would never allow the hon. gentleman to bring those old, stale charges forward and, by repeating them, to get fastened on the public mind a statement which had been proved not to be a fact. General Doyle had it simply repeated to him; he only heard it at second-hand and never knew anything about it himself; and he was the first man to approach him (Mr. Jones) and ask him for a reconciliation, and he was sure General Doyle would be very much annoyed at the use made of his name in that discussion. He (Mr. Jones) did not think the hon. gentlemen need be alarmed about His Excellency the Governor-General being aware of his (Mr. Jones's) position on that or any other matter. His public character or position did not rest upon any such frail basis as the words of the hon. member for Cumberland. He now occupied an office which had been filled by a man on whose head a reward was set.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES said hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but he did not wish to say anything against his predecessor (Sir George Cartier), and he only mentioned it to show the hypocrisy of the men who were making those charges against himself when they had been associated in the Government of Canada with a man of Sir George Cartier's antecedents. Now,

MR. JONES.

at this last moment, those super-loyal gentlemen had discovered that it was not proper that he (Mr. Jones) should be a member of that Government, but the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was neither a model in loyalty nor in political morality for any hon. member to follow. When he (Mr. Jones) sought a model in either he should take a higher standard than the hon. member for Cumberland, and as long as he occupied a position as a member of the Government he should hold an independent position. He was not going to sink into a position of slavery because he was a member of the Government. He held the same opinions now as he held before, and those opinions would be endorsed by every intelligent voter of Nova Scotia. When the hon. gentleman had nothing new to bring forward, but simply to try and explain away his own inconsistencies, he brought up these old charges; and he (Mr. Jones) had felt bound to show how hard-driven the hon. gentleman must be; how he must have felt the force of the observations made by him (Mr. Jones) the other night; how, in the averted faces of his friends, he must have seen that he was looked upon as having been guilty of transgressions in his own country that would not bear the investigation of Parliament. The hon. gentleman need not be afraid of his (Mr. Jones's) position; he would take care of that; and he warned the hon. gentleman to take care of his own.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he felt that he could not properly allow some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken to pass without observation. He had said that he was not afraid of the hon. member for Cumberland, or of discussing matters with him in this House and that he had had discussions with him on the subject in the Province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) probably still thought he was in Nova Scotia, and carrying on an election contest, because, in his speech on this occasion, he had set aside every parliamentary rule of propriety in the course he had taken. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not hesitate to say that a more unparliament-

tary, and, in a parliamentary sense, a more discreditable speech could not possibly have been made by an hon. member than the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. member was charged—properly charged, if the hon. the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) chose to take the responsibility of making the charge—that there were a number of reasons why he ought not, in the opinion of the hon. member for Cumberland, to hold his position as a member of the Cabinet. His hon. friend the member for Cumberland might have been erroneous in his views, and the hon. member (Mr. Jones) might be the most proper person to be one of the confidential advisers of the Crown. The hon. member for Cumberland might be right or wrong in that, but he had a right to hold those views. The hon. the Premier, when he held the position which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) now held, said that it was the duty of the Opposition to criticise the Government either in regard to their administration, their legislation, or their composition. The hon. member for Cumberland had taken the ground that the hon. member for Halifax ought not to be a member of the Government and ought not to be a confidential adviser of the Crown, and he had a right to take that ground. His reasons were parliamentary. There was not a single word or expression used by him that was not parliamentary. He had the right to charge the hon. member, if he thought proper, with being unworthy of a place in the councils of the Sovereign. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was not arguing for the moment that his hon. friend the member for Cumberland was correct in his conclusions; but, if he had come to those conclusions, he had a right to state them, and then it was the bounden duty of the hon. member for Halifax to answer the attack. Did the hon. gentleman answer that attack? No; he turned round and, in the most unparliamentary way, without any relevancy in the world, said—there was the Pictou Railway, and the Springhill Mines, and the lease by the hon. member for Cumberland of a house in Halifax, and therefore the hon. mem-

ber for Cumberland was not to attack him or make charges against him. The hon. gentleman tried to divert the attention of the House from the charges which, in a parliamentary way, were brought against him by the hon. member for Cumberland by trying to slang that hon. gentleman.

MR. CASEY: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would assert that the language of the hon. gentleman was slang, and unparliamentary slang; and he had no doubt the Speaker would say that, in using that language, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was perfectly in order, and that the hon. member for West Elgin was perfectly out of order.

MR. CASEY said the point of order he had raised was that the right hon. gentleman had used the words "unparliamentary slang."

MR. SPEAKER: I hardly understand what it means, I never heard of slang in that way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), feeling the lash on his back, and the manner in which he had been punished, had writhed like a toad under the harrow; and, like a sailor when tied at the gangway, had begun to blaspheme and swear at the man who ordered the punishment. They all knew—and the hon. gentleman who came from Halifax, which was a naval port, knew—that, when a sailor was tied up at the gangway under the cat, and was writhing under the punishment, he was allowed, by naval rule, to slang and abuse the captain; and he supposed that under no other principle could Mr. Speaker have permitted the hon. gentleman to have gone on, suffering as he (Mr. Jones) must have been under the deserved punishment inflicted by his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper), and abuse his hon. friend in such a manner. They would take the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) on his own ground. What though every word he said against the hon. gentleman was true; what though every one of these charges was well founded; what though his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) got from his son for the lease of that house \$600; what though he

(Mr. Tupper) had made \$40,000 out of the railroad; what though the Springhill Mine charge was true; what though he (Mr. Tupper) had committed every crime in the decalogue; admitting all this, he would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) whether his hon. friend was not a representative of the people in the House, and whether he had not duties and responsibilities, as a member of the House, to fulfil; and so, no matter though his hon. friend had committed every crime in the decalogue and known to criminal law, he would ask the hon. gentleman whether his hon. friend had not a right, as a representative in Parliament of the people, to bring the hon. gentleman to account; and whether it was not his hon. friend's duty, though his own crimes and sins extended from pitch and toss to manslaughter, to do so. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) maintained that his hon. friend had a right to bring up the hon. gentleman on those charges, and it was no answer for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) to say: "Oh, I may have committed all these crimes and sins, but it does not rest in your mouth to say so."

MR. JONES: Did I refer to any point the hon. member for Cumberland did not refer to?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why, my hon. friend was replying to the argument—the unparliamentary speech which the hon. gentleman made yesterday.

MR. JONES: You will find that he replied before.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No; he did not reply to that before. The hon. gentleman took good care in his answers to the indictment preferred against him before the House and before the country, and that this country preferred against him, not to give my hon. friend an opportunity to reply; my hon. friend had no such opportunity. He could not, by parliamentary rules, answer those charges. My hon. friend had risen to a personal explanation in which he was limited to a short time. My hon. friend had an opportunity to explain and go into the facts and charges brought by the hon. gentleman. The question brought before the House by my hon. friend was

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

whether the hon. gentleman was fit to be in the Cabinet or not. I am not going over all the ground, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman would like me to do so, and enter into all the points which have been brought up by my hon. friend one after another. There is the question of the flag.

MR. JONES: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hear the laugh, but this is a loyal country.

MR. JONES: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman may laugh and may attempt to sneer down the charges that have been brought against him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: But the hon. gentleman did not sneer when this charge was first made. He then got up and said it was a falsehood—"I pronounce it a falsehood"—and he now pronounces it a false slander. But who told this falsehood? Who perpetrated this false slander? I would ask the hon. gentleman.

MR. JONES: Whoever states it states a falsehood, and whoever repeats it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman says it is a foul slander and a base falsehood.

MR. JONES: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He then repeated it as to an original statement?

MR. JONES: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The first man who repeated it was that fine loyal old soldier, Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: He did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He was the first man who repeated it.

MR. JONES: He did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The first man who repeated it was that fine old soldier, Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: No, no.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes; it was Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: No, no.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. DYMOND: I rise to a point of order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman rises to a point of order.

MR. DYMOND: It is this: I ask you whether, according to English parliamentary practice—and Canadian parliamentary practice falls under the same precedent, when a gentleman has once given a solemn declaration on the floor of Parliament that a charge is false, it is parliamentary to repeat that charge, unless it is to formulate it against him as an accusation which he must prove or disprove.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I desire to speak to this point of order. The point I am speaking to at this moment is a charge brought by the hon. the Minister of Militia, that the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia, Judge Desbarres, Sir Hastings Doyle, the Hon. Mr. Vail, and Mr. Thompson, are all liars, and have misrepresented facts.

MR. JONES: I wish to speak to this point of order. The question was this: he (Sir John A. Macdonald) said that Sir Hastings Doyle was the first man who repeated this statement, and this is not the case. Sir William Young was the first man who repeated it to Sir Hastings Doyle.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Oh, no.

MR. SPEAKER: I think there is no violation of order, for this reason: that the hon. member for Kingston, as I understand the matter, was stating that such an assertion was made, and not that it was true. If he said that the assertion was true, he would be entirely out of order; but, as it is, the hon. gentleman is in order.

An HON. MEMBER: Do you believe it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, I cannot say—well, I do believe it, if you want to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman is now entirely out of order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, then, in a parliamentary sense, I do not believe it; but, in the other sense, I do. I say that the hon. gentleman stated that any man who repeated that charge committed a foul slander. He declared that the first man who made that statement was Sir William Young. He did not repeat it, for this was the original statement. The original statement was this: that the hon. the Minister of Militia did make such a statement; he made that statement, and that was the statement made to Sir Hastings Doyle, that old soldier, that man of high honour, that kindly old man, that gallant old soldier, who would never have said such a thing if he did not believe it to be perfectly true. I am glad to count him among my friends. I believe it, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he (Sir Hastings Doyle) believed that charge, or he would not have written to my hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) in the way he did.

MR. JONES: It was not true; he was misinformed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman knows that there is no doubt that, when the news of these proceedings reach Sir Hastings Doyle, he will repeat it and I venture to say that Sir Hastings Doyle will endorse every word contained in the letter which has been published. I have no doubt whatever about it, and I tell you this: I shall make it my business to see that this will be brought before Sir Hastings Doyle, and, if he is alive, I shall be able to lay before Parliament the statement that he does not retract one single word of that charge.

MR. JONES: The papers have gone.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why did Sir Hastings Doyle write to his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper)? He wrote to him because he believed the charge to be true. Did they think that he would have written a letter like that from Halifax, in his capacity as Governor, to the hon. member for Cumberland in order that he (Mr. Tupper) might convey that information to friends in Ottawa, and to the people of Canada, of the conduct and the language, the disloyal, the improper language of the hon. the Minister of Militia? Was this fine old soldier a

promulgator of slanders which he did not believe? Was he going to scrape together slanders and unfounded statements made against any man? Was he likely to spread abroad unfounded, false, slanderous gossip as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) contended? for the hon. gentleman contended that this was a false and slanderous statement, Would he send it up for the purpose, send it up with the intention of being used, in order that the people of Ottawa, in order that the Parliament of Canada, in order that the representatives of the people should not be mistaken about the character of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones)? Sir Hastings Doyle could not have been mistaken; there was no mistake or misapprehension, and the hon. gentleman, who had come up here and taken the oath of allegiance, had said that he would be glad when the British flag was torn down. That gallant old soldier would not have written that letter if he did not believe it to be true; and why did he believe it to be true? Because of the evidence of a man of honour, of high position, and of the statements of a man to whose position the hon. gentleman would never attain if he achieved the highest dreams of his ambition. The hon. gentleman could not hope to equal him for character, for social position, or literary standing.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not impugning the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) without witnesses.

MR. JONES: Who?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Judge Desbarres.

MR. JONES: Judge Desbarres' name was not mentioned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the first letter?

MR. JONES: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I say it was.

MR. JONES: Where?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Look at the first letter and you will see.

MR. TUPPER: It is mentioned there.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, it is. The names of Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, and Mr. Thompson are mentioned.

MR. TUPPER: These three names are certainly mentioned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that these three names were mentioned in the first letter, or he was greatly mistaken. With respect to the amount of evidence brought to prove it, and the evidence which forced a kindly old gentleman like Sir Hastings Doyle to take the responsibility of making this statement, and hold up that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) and authorize the hon. member for Cumberland to hold him up to the public as a disloyal man, there was the evidence of those three men, Sir William Young, Justice Desbarres, and Mr. Thompson, and, in the second letter, the name of Mr. Vail was mentioned. Now, the hon. the Minister of Militia said in his speech just now that he had proved beyond a doubt to the mind of every honest man in the country that a job had been committed on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland with respect to the Pictou Railway, because he had produced the words of a speech of Mr. Archibald, delivered in the House of Assembly concerning that matter, and because he read that speech, although the charge was made in the course of an attack on the Government, by the leader of the Opposition against one of the leaders of the Administration; although that was merely made in Parliament, yet that speech did not convey the charge which the hon. gentleman wished to fasten on his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper), of having improperly taken advantage of his position as Minister to put money in his pocket. Although that charge was not contained in it, although no personal dishonour was attached to it, and although, in the letter subsequently written, Mr. Archibald had disavowed the making of any such accusation, yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said that to the mind of every honest, candid man, the statement of Mr. Archibald, the leader of the Opposition, was convincing. This was the same as if the speeches of

the hon. the Premier while he sat in this House opposing him (Sir John A. Macdonald) for the last ten years, were to be kept as final evidence against him (Sir John A. Macdonald), and that any speech which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was to make against the hon. gentleman in his position of leader of the Opposition could be kept and taken as evidence against him ten years hence. The hon. gentleman would not like that, and yet that was the evidence, the irrefragable evidence, which he brought up against his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) to show that there was something wrong, and that some jobbery was committed in connection with the Pictou Railway, although Mr. Archibald had afterwards explicitly denied under his hand that he had intended to make a charge of personal dishonour or of personal complicity in this connection on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland. But, supposing that Mr. Archibald used language which reflected upon his hon. friend, must they accept the statement of Mr. Archibald, a political opponent, the leader of the Opposition, a statement made in the hot struggle of Parliament, in parliamentary discussion, as a conclusive evidence of the truth of such a charge? And yet he turned round and declared that Sir William Young was a liar, a foul calumniator, that Judge Desbarres was a liar, a foul calumniator; that Mr. Thompson, Howe's son-in-law, was the same; that the lamented Mr. Vail was a liar and foul calumniator. This was the statement of the hon. gentleman, that these four men had all told lies, and were all guilty of perpetrating a foul slander on the hon. gentleman. Would anybody believe that? He did not believe that the majority, if sworn jurymen, would come to the conclusion to set aside the statement of four men like these because the hon. gentleman said he did not say it, and produced a newspaper in which this portion of his speech was conveniently left out. His hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) had shown how things, in the most marvellous and mysterious way disavowed by everybody, were eliminated from speeches in the public press. No-

body knew how this happened, but yet these eliminations took place when any matters which would be very inconvenient were in question. They saw how this was done. His hon. friend (Mr. Jones) said, on looking back at his speech, that he did not find that he had ever used any such language, and, therefore, that everybody who said the contrary were liars, scoundrels, and calumniators, and that he never done so-and-so. The hon. gentleman had the hardihood to state that the head of the Supreme Court of his own Province, the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, was a liar and a scoundrel, and that he based this charge on the most improper motive, on the lowest and basest possible motive, because he said that this gentleman, Sir William Young, was politically opposed to him, and on the ground that this gentleman was a warm partisan. And why? Because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) did not, in his desperation, wish to defend himself against this charge, but Sir William Young said he heard him (Mr. Jones) say it; there could be no mistake about it. The hon. gentleman did use that language, and he did say that he would take off his hat and cheer when the British flag was pulled down. That was vouched for by the Chief Justice, a man who presided at the head of the Courts of law, and who administered the law, both civil and criminal, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and a man on whose judgment he would defend the law, the liberty, the property, and the reputation of every man in the Province of Nova Scotia, including the hon. gentleman himself. He (Mr. Jones) had ventured to say that this gentleman of high standing, of high character, of high position, honoured by the people, honoured by the representatives of the people, honoured by the Crown, the honourable recipient of a title in recognition of his long services, honoured by his own Province as a great and a good and a learned man, and eminent Judge, had lied and foully lied, he had lied in his throat, that he was a calumniator; and that Justice Desbarres was a calumniator, that Justice Desbarres was a liar, because they told Sir Hastings Doyle that that gentleman

(Mr. Jones) did say that he would cheer and wave his hat when the British flag was pulled down from the citadel. Then there was the evidence of Mr. Thompson on this part; but Mr. Thompson, it seemed, was a son-in-law of the great Joseph Howe, and, therefore, unworthy of belief. Although the hon. gentleman had said all this, he asked the House if they were asked to take the statement of a criminal against all these witnesses; the statement of a man on his trial as to the truth of a statement, against the statement of all the witnesses, on his coming before the country and the House to ask them to do so? But the country and the House would not do so. The country and the House and the people of Canada would believe to their dying day that these gentlemen told a true story, and that Sir Hastings Doyle, Governor of the Province of Nova Scotia, and Commander of the Forces, believed that statement. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Hastings Doyle would be shocked at the base use made of his letter; but that gallant old soldier had written that letter to his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) for the very purpose of making this charge public. When that letter was written it was written to be published and disseminated. His hon. friend had only done what Sir Hastings Doyle had intended should be done. Sir Hastings Doyle had written that letter in order that he might inform Parliament, and show to the country what fashion of a man this was, who was coming up to take the oath of allegiance to his Sovereign, whose flag he would cheer if it were pulled down. Then there was Mr. Vail. Surely the Premier, who had selected him as a man of honour, as a man of integrity, as a man whose word should be believed, would not let Mr. Vail's word be disputed, though they were asked to consider that the Chief Justice, Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres and all these other men were unworthy of belief. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had supposed that his hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have felt it his duty, when this attack was made upon the character of the Judges of Nova Scotia, to have risen in his place and defended them from such

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

accusations. It seemed to him that it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lafamme), when these Judges were branded as liars and scoundrels, to defend Sir William Young and Justice Desbarres from the attack made on their honour, their honesty and their integrity. But the hon. gentleman had sat still. He did not know if the hon. the Premier would allow the same attack to be made on the veracity and the honesty of Mr. Vail. That gentleman was a white Vail when he was a Minister, but he did not know whether he had become a black Vail since the unfortunate affair of Digby. He (Mr. Vail) had retired into private life, but he did not suppose that he had suffered any dishonour—he had been merely unfortunate. It had been the fate of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Vail), to fall at the election. This had very nearly been his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) fate at his last election, and he was told by some hon. gentlemen that it was going to be his fate at the next election. These things would happen; and yet, the day after he had fallen, the day after his misfortune, he was just as honest, just as worthy of belief, and just as veracious, as the day when he held office and was a sworn adviser of the representative of his Sovereign, and the bosom friend and colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite. Notwithstanding this, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) declared that Mr. Vail was a man unworthy of belief. The hon. gentleman said that any man who repeated the statement in question was a foul slanderer. Well, Mr. Vail had repeated that statement, and Sir Hastings Doyle had repeated it.

MR. JONES: Mr. Vail was not present.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman said that whoever originally made the statement or repeated it was a slanderer and a liar. Then Mr. Vail was a liar. The hon. gentleman had recommended and put Mr. Vail into the Cabinet, because, at that time, it was not convenient for him to take his place in the Cabinet. Mr. Vail was sent there and put into the Ministry in order to keep the seat warm for his hon. friend (Mr. Jones)

for fear that the eggs should addle. He (Mr. Vail) sat on the eggs until the hon. gentleman was ready to hatch them. He (Mr. Jones) put Mr. Vail into the Government, and now it appeared there was no one so poor as to do him reverence; and it was strange in what an unceremonious manner the hon. gentleman had been shoved out into the cold. At this time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) took a little journey, and rode a little more, as the hon. the Premier would say, than a Sabbath-day's journey, on his way to Quebec, in order to supply Mr. Vail's place. It looked very like it. Scant courtesy had been shown that gentleman (Mr. Vail). In Ireland, when a criminal was about to be beheaded, after sentence had been passed, he was accustomed to pray to the Lord, to give him a long day. The hon. gentleman had not given Mr. Vail a long day. To be sure, when he first came into the Government, they were told what an able man he was, what a valuable acquisition he was, what additional strength he was to the Government. Among the Ministerial supporters of Nova Scotia, they were told that Mr. Vail's super-eminent abilities, super-eminent qualities, and the claims, the paramount claims, which he had upon the Government, for the position to which he was invited—although he was a perfectly new man in the House, and although, previously, he never sat in the Dominion Parliament. They did not give Mr. Vail much time to think about it, and, although they said that when he came into the Government he would be an additional strength to the Government, it was a relief to the Premier to get rid of him, and it was said that to get rid of him would also additionally strengthen the Government. He evidently had not proved to be so much of a soldier as it was thought he would, and his inability to carry the Militia Estimates, which the Premier had to do for him, did not speak well for his acquaintance with his Department. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not think that the late Minister of Militia should have been appointed, but at the same time he held that he should not be called a liar or a foul slanderer because he happened to repeat the accusation against the

member for Halifax, and because he had been unfortunate. It was said that the road to a certain place was paved with good intentions, and it seemed that Mr. Vail had been busy paving. True, it might be, as Mr. Vail said, that Mr. Jones would cheer when the flag was pulled down, but that he (Mr. Jones) said he did not want to fight England, he only wanted to fight Canada. England and the Dominion must be severed in order that Canada and Nova Scotia might fight. But, said the Minister of Militia, if that was a little rebellious, if there was a little treason in it, Sir George Cartier was, at one time, a rebel too. Could such a defence as that be set up in the Parliament of Canada? There was, at the time that Sir George took up arms, a great struggle, and some of those who took up arms paid the penalty of their act by dying on the scaffold or in the field. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not believe the hon. gentleman would have been bold enough to take up arms as Sir George Cartier did. The hon. the Minister of Militia was like mine Ancient Pistol, who spoke brave words at the bridge, but who was dismissed for cowardice. He could speak brave words at the bridge, he could say that he would cheer when the flag was pulled down, but he would not take up arms and pull it down. And, in his desperation now, he insulted everybody standing higher than himself, and brought charges against the hon. member for Cumberland which he could not prove. It would not do, and, so long as he was in Parliament, and had anything to do with the affairs of the Dominion, it would be remembered by every loyal man that he was the man who, because the Provinces were united by Confederation, was anxious to set Nova Scotia against Canada, and to sever the connection between the British Crown and the Dominion in order to bring that about. The country must believe the evidence of Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, Mr. Thompson, and his (Mr. Jones's) friend and colleague, Mr. Vail. The country would say that he had been guilty, and as long as he was in the Cabinet, the country would say: there sits a Minister of

Militia who said what was treasonable, and has not repented of it at this moment.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was quite sure that every hon. member who had witnessed the pitiable exhibition which the hon. gentleman had made of himself would feel compassion for the weakness he had displayed. The right hon. member for Kingston had been celebrated throughout his public life for the vigorous coarseness of his abuse of the public men with whom he had come in contact, and he had not scrupled to exercise that kind of abuse towards even those who had been his own colleagues, when he found it necessary to trample them down that he might triumph. The hon. the Minister of Militia had just won a great triumph at Halifax, notwithstanding the tremendous and the improper influences which had been used against him; and his victory was not only a personal one, but he had defeated that which hon. gentlemen opposite had hoped would be a serious embarrassment to the Ministry, at the very time when they thought it was within their grasp. The vigour with which the hon. the Minister of Militia had defended himself, showed that he was not a man to be put down, even by the noise and vituperation of the hon. member for Cumberland; and, for having thus defended himself, that hon. gentleman and his friends would never forgive him. This system of abuse of the Minister of Militia had been initiated by the member for Cumberland, and the House would agree with him that his attempts and those of his friends to put down the member for Halifax had utterly failed. It seemed to be the deliberate purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite to make the political life of those gentlemen who ventured to dispute their dicta as disagreeable as possible. He would ask why the right hon. gentleman from Kingston should parade his loyalty?—He, who had been an associate of the men who burned down the Parliament buildings; who was associated with the men who had hoisted the black flag to insult the Governor-General; who was associated with the men who had formed a league at Kingston to drive the French into the sea,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to use their own words; who was associated with the men who pelted the Governor-General with rotten eggs; who was associated with the men who hoisted the black flag of independence at Sandwich,—the man who had as a colleague him who threatened to use the bayonets of Nova Scotia against the people of the Western Provinces. After the explicit denial of the Minister of Militia that he had uttered the sentiments attributed to him, the member for Kingston should be desirous to accept this statement from one who no one could deny was an honourable man. But it was not the object of the hon. gentlemen opposite to get a satisfactory explanation, but to heap as much dirt as they could upon the character of a political opponent—to humble, if they could, the standing of an honourable member of this House. But the country would know the object of this tirade of abuse that had been uttered by the two hon. gentlemen opposite, and would value it precisely as he (Mr. Mackenzie) did, and that was as being worth a little less than nothing.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was about the value they would place on the Premier's word.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would venture to assert that his word would pass where the hon. gentleman's would not. Those who were constantly making assertions like the hon. gentleman, and abusing every person else, must be very bad themselves. It was an undoubted evidence of innate depravity. He would not reply to the personal remarks of the hon. gentleman, as he (Mr. Mackenzie) would be willing to have his word go with that of the hon. gentleman before the country, and was quite prepared to accept its judgment between them. The right hon. gentleman spoke about setting aside parliamentary law and order. He himself was out of order a dozen times, and was called to order several times; and then he spoke, to avoid his being out of order, by digressions in a direction by which he reached the same point, but in such a discursive manner as to avoid the direct charge of being out of order. But even

with that he was out of order, because no member was permitted to evade the point of order in that way, especially if that evasion was for the purpose of discrediting the word of another gentleman on the floor of the House. When the right hon. gentleman ventured to lecture gentlemen on this side of the House for being out of order, he ought to set a somewhat different example. The right hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Vail. It was very easy to abuse a man behind his back; and that the right hon. gentleman was particularly good at doing. He was much more brave behind a man's back, generally, than he was to his face. Mr. Vail, whatever his faults, or his excellencies, was not now before the House; and should not be made the subject of hostile criticism in this House. Mr. Vail was a gentleman whom every person respected for his private and personal worth, as well as for his political integrity. He might be a defeated man for the moment; he might appear again in political life, and he might never appear; but they were bound, at all events, to show a decent respect in the amenities of life to those who occupied the position that he did. The right hon. gentleman had endeavoured, by every means in his power, to throw discredit alike upon Mr. Vail and upon the Minister of Militia; and, over the head of the Minister of Militia, to vent his ill-feelings towards the other hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman had repeatedly said to-night that his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) had called the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia a liar and a slanderer. No such language was used. What was said was that any one that persisted in making that statement was circulating a slander and telling a falsehood; but, no matter what position the man might occupy in this country, he must not be allowed to use that position to shelter him in statements that were incorrect. If the Chief Justice made the assertion that he heard this statement, when his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was conscious of not having made the statement, he had no right to do that; and the mere fact that he happened to be Chief Justice must not shield him from a statement which implied that he had

been stating what was incorrect, either from hearsay or otherwise. He knew that no one was more ready than the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) to use the very strongest language, no matter to whom it might apply; and they knew, from the language used by the right hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), towards Lord Mulgrave, that he was sinning against the highest person in the Province in the language that he used. It would appear, from remarks that the right hon. gentleman made, that anything that was said on that side of the House was to be believed as a matter of course. It was supposed, also, that gentlemen on that side of the House were to be at liberty to attack hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side in any way they pleased, and they were not to be replied to. He told the right hon. gentleman, once for all, that he could not persist in these tactics with impunity; but that he would be answered as frequently as the attack was made, and answered in a way that perhaps he would not expect. It was just as well that both sides of the House should understand that such tactics as had been pursued in the course of this debate, towards members of the Government and gentlemen on the Government side of the House, were not only outrageous in their character, but were altogether at variance with that parliamentary courtesy which was necessary for the transaction of business. The right hon. gentleman quoted Shakespeare to show that his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was very brave in words, but not very brave in deeds; that he might speak bravely, but he would fight but little; and that Sir George Cartier backed up his words by his acts, and that he fought. He was afraid the right hon. gentleman's historical memory failed him. If he recollected aright, Sir George had used words, but when it came to the use of weapons, he was the first in the flight, and the others were after him; it was a race, and not a battle.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You will not, I am sure, slander the dead. Sir George Cartier fought at St. Denis from morning until night.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not want to slander the dead; I never had a difference in my life with Sir George Cartier, and I have no reason to say an unkind word of him. The right hon. gentleman took up Sir George Cartier's name to suit his purpose; but I must not use it to bring out the truth, it appears—the old story. He can do what he likes, but we must not mention any name.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You are mistaken.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is the popular rumour; perhaps the right hon. gentleman was there also.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have the personal testimony of General Wolford Nelson, who told me himself, and who was in command at St. Denis.

MR. LAURIER: It is matter of history that Sir George Cartier left the field of St. Denis before the battle of St. Denis had commenced.

MR. MASSON: Slander; slander.

MR. MACKENZIE said that one of the few occasions on which that hon. member and himself had anything like a warm debate in this House, he recollected very well saying in a jocular way across the House what he had said to-night as a matter of history; and he recollected very well that there was no response, except a little feeling. There was no denial of it at all. However, he was quite willing to accept the statement of any person who said he knew the fact. He wished to point out, however, that gentlemen must not expect to use names, and not have the real facts of the case connected with the person brought out. He had no desire to say anything further in reference to this somewhat painful debate, which had been provoked entirely, as he considered, by the unmerited and extraordinary course pursued by the hon. member for Cumberland in attacking the Minister of Militia. He had only to say, in conclusion, that gentlemen on the opposite side might depend on it that such attacks could not be permitted to be made with impunity.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

“3. That we are happy to learn from His Excellency, that the arbitration on the Fishery claims, under the terms of the Washington Treaty, has been concluded, and an award has been made by the Commissioners of \$5,500,000 as compensation to Canada and Newfoundland for the use of their fisheries during the term of the present Treaty, and that we feel, with His Excellency, that, although this amount is much less than that claimed by His Excellency's Government, yet that, having assented to the creation of the tribunal for the determination of their value, we are bound loyally to assent to the decision given.

“4. That we are glad to know that the exhibition of Canadian manufactures and products at Sydney, New South Wales, was successfully carried out; that we trust, with His Excellency, that the result will be the opening up of a new market for Canadian goods even in so remote a region as the Australasian colonies, shipments of Canadian productions having already been made; and that, although the expenditure will slightly exceed the estimate, we doubt not the cost to Canada will be amply repaid by the extension of her trade.”

Motions agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed.

“5. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that preparations have been uninterruptedly carried on during the last six months for securing an ample but select exhibition of Canada's products and manufactures at the great exhibition to be held at Paris during the current year; that a further estimate will be required to meet the expenditure, and that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as Chairman of the British Commissioners, has assigned a most prominent place to Canada in one of the main towers, where a Canadian trophy is now being erected.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he wished to impress upon the Premier the importance of helping those who intended to be exhibitors, by the purchase of goods, holding the goods as security; thus, enabling them to transmit their goods to Paris, as was done in the previous Exhibition at Paris in 1867. Unless this were done, he feared the most ingenious, and the best of our manufactures would, for want of means, in these hard times, to raise the money, decline to exhibit. In the last Paris Exhibition, the Government advanced about three-fourths of the value of the goods exhibited, and got some beautiful articles sent in consequence.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the Commissioner, Mr. Keefer, was instructed to secure a fair representation

of all the important manufacturers of Canada, if possible, by obtaining a selection from the parties themselves; and, where it was impossible to obtain that, he was to purchase to a limited extent. He was informed by Mr. Keefer, and Mr. Selwyn, who had been assisting him, with Dr. May and Mr. Perrault, that nearly every branch was now fairly represented in the Exhibition. The Government had purchased a few thousand dollars' worth, but not of very serious amount.

MR. MITCHELL asked for information in regard to the subject of the fourth paragraph, as sundry newspaper paragraphs had appeared intimating that the United States did not intend to pay the five and a-half millions, according to the award.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be inconvenient to answer the question now, but at the proper time he would give the information.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"6. That while we are grieved to know that a very disastrous fire occurred in June last in the city of St. John, which caused the destruction of a large portion of the city, including all the public buildings owned by the Dominion Government, we feel that His Excellency's Government were right in deeming it necessary to contribute \$20,000 to assist in relieving the immediate wants of the people who were rendered destitute by so appalling a calamity, as His Excellency was in sanctioning the appropriation of some public money with which to commence the erection of new buildings for the public business; and that we shall have pleasure in confirming these acts in the usual way.

"7. That we are much gratified to be informed that, during the last summer, His Excellency's Commissioners made another Treaty with the Blackfeet, Blood and Piegan Indians, by which the Indian title is extinguished over a territory of 51,000 square miles west of Treaty No. 4, and south of Treaty No. 6; that the Treaty has been made on terms nearly the same as those under Treaty No. 6, though somewhat less onerous, and the entire territory west of Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, and from the boundary nearly to the 55th degree of north latitude, embracing about 40,000 square miles, has now been acquired by peaceful negotiation with the native tribes, who place implicit faith in the honour and justice of the British Crown."

Motions agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"8. That we learn with much interest, that, early in the past summer, a large body of Indians under Sitting Bull, from the United States, crossed into British territory, to escape from the United States troops, and have since remained on the Canadian side; and that the United States Government made a friendly but unsuccessful attempt to induce these Indians to return to their reservations; and that we agree with His Excellency, in hoping that such arrangements may yet be made as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement, and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD proposed that the paragraph be amended by adding, after the word "settlement," the words "and possible removal."

MR. MACKENZIE explained that by the word "settlement," he meant settlement on the reservations. He reminded the right hon. gentleman that the Address had been agreed to, as it stood, by the Senate, and that it would be awkward to alter it in the House. With this explanation, he hoped that the paragraph would pass.

Resolution, amended by the insertion of the words "or return" after "settlement," *agreed to.*

Motion made and question proposed :

"9. That we are well pleased to know that the surveys of the Pacific Railway have been pressed to completion during the past season; that a complete instrumental survey of the route, by the Valleys of the North Thompson and Lower Fraser Rivers, has been made with a view to ascertain definitely whether that route presents more favourable features than the routes already surveyed to Dean Inlet and Bute Inlet respectively; and that it is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable His Excellency's Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea; and that we thank His Excellency for the promise that full information will be laid before us at an early day of the season's work in this and other directions."

MR. TUPPER asked at what time the hon. the Premier would be able to communicate to Parliament the decision the Government had come to in regard to the Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could not tell, because the Government had not the information before them yet.

MR. TUPPER said he hoped the hon. gentleman would give an oppor-

tunity to have the matter fairly reviewed by Parliament.

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

"10. That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that, under this and other influences, there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada, in common with other countries, is passing away."

MR. MASSON said he did not believe the commercial depression was passing away, as expressed in this paragraph, and asked the Premier to alter the construction of it so that it might embody the views of all the members of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said that one hon. member of the Opposition had objected because stronger terms had not been used in the paragraph, and he had heard no one express the views urged by the hon. gentleman, except the hon. gentleman himself.

MR. MASSON said he was not, perhaps, sufficiently conversant with the English language to distinguish the difference between "trust" and "hope." He was of opinion that the depression was not passing away, that there was no indication that it was passing away, and he did not agree with his hon. friend who said that it was unpatriotic to say that it was passing away. Did the members who lived in the city of Montreal think the depression was passing away? In that city he had been told that men had come to the contractors and had said, "For God's sake, give us work, even at half a dollar per day, if you like." If they passed this resolution, these people would consider it ironical. It did not matter whether the impression was right or wrong, the hon. the Prime Minister had no right to ask the House to take such a position on a matter which they could not be certain of until the Budget Speech was before them. They should follow the English usage, and place in the Address nothing which could cause any difference of opinion. It would be a graceful act on the part

MR. TUPPER.

of the Government to follow the ordinary rule in this case and amend the clause. About the second year after Confederation, there was an expression in the Address which, lawyers contended, did not mean what was desired to be stated. Mr. Dorion objected that there was a difference of opinion as to the words used in the Address, and the right hon. member for Kingston followed the English precedent, and dropped out of the Address the words objected to, so that it might be the unanimous opinion of the House.

MR. HOLTON said his hon. friend for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) was quite right in the position he assumed, that the House ought not to be invited to compromise members in regard to what might be brought up at a later stage of the Session; but, if the hon. member looked at this clause carefully he would see that his own canon was fulfilled. They were asked to say this:

"That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away."

That was a matter of fact communicated to them officially by the Governor-General. All they were asked to say was that they hoped the bountiful harvest and the improvement in the revenue returns might be taken as ground for trust that the depression was passing away, or had begun to pass away.

MR. MASSON said the words "thus indicating" implied that the state of things referred to did exist. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), and every member who had spoken on the position, had declared that the depression was not passing away. He did not suppose the hon. the Minister of Finance wanted to commit them to the statement that it was passing away.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

"12. That we thank His Excellency for informing us, that his attention having been called to some imperfections in the existing system of auditing the Public Accounts, a measure providing for a more thorough and effective supervision will be submitted for our consideration.

"13. That we share with His Excellency the conviction that the prospect of obtaining, at an early day, greater facilities for reaching the North-Western Territories and the Province of Manitoba, is sure to attract a larger number of settlers every year, and that, as much of the prosperity of the Dominion depends on the rapid settlement of the fertile lands in those territories, it is desirable and necessary to facilitate such settlement as much as possible; and that we are pleased to learn that, in order to effect this, measures will be submitted for our consideration concerning the registration of titles, the enactment of a Homestead Law, and the promotion of railway enterprise in districts not touched by the Canada Pacific Railway.

"14. That we shall give our best attention to any measure submitted to us for better securing the Independence of Parliament.

"15. That, being informed by His Excellency that experience has shown that certain changes may advantageously be made in the departmental arrangements existing at present, we shall respectfully consider any Bill submitted to us for accomplishing this purpose, without increasing the expenditure or the number of Departments.

"16. That we feel with His Excellency, that it is very desirable there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in spirituous liquors, and being aware that hitherto that trade has been regulated by Provincial laws, or laws existing before the Confederation of the Provinces, although there has been lately a conflict of authority as to the jurisdiction of the local authorities, we shall gladly receive any Bill making the necessary provision which may be submitted for our consideration, as we shall also any other measures found necessary for the amendment of existing laws and submitted for our approval.

"17. That we thank His Excellency for the assurance that the Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before us at an early day, and that they have been prepared with an anxious desire to provide for all the branches of the public service, and the execution of pressing public works within the limits of the expected revenue, without increasing the burden of taxation; and for having directed that the Public Accounts of the past financial year shall be laid before us."

Motions agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

"That the said resolution be, referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Mackenzie, Smith (Westmoreland), Laflamme, Jones, De St. Georges, and Charlton, to draft an Address pursuant thereto."

Motion agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE, from the Committee, reported the draft of an Address, and the same, being read a second time, was agreed to.

The said Address was then ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General by such members of this House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

COMMITTEE TO PREPARE LISTS APPOINTED

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

"That a Special Committee of seven be appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House on Friday, the 8th inst., said Committee to be composed of Mr. Mackenzie, Sir John A. Macdonald, Messrs. Smith (Westmoreland), Blake, Holton, Tupper and Masson."

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved :

"That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved :

"That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

MR. MACKENZIE laid before the House the Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year, 1st July, 1876, to 30th June, 1877, on the works under his control.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) laid before the House the Tenth Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. MILLS laid before the House the Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. CARTWRIGHT laid before the House the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. LAFLAMME laid before the House the Report of the Minister of Justice, as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the six months ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) laid before the House the Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877; and the Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the calendar year 1877.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes to
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 18th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

MR. HUNTINGTON laid before the House the Report of the Postmaster-General for the year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. LAURIER laid before the House the Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenue of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877; also, fourth Report on Weights and Measures, being Supplement No. 2 to the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1877; also Supplement No. 1 to the Inland Revenue Report, for the year ended 30th June, 1877; and Report on Adulteration of Food, being Supplement No. 3 to the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1877.

MR. JONES (Halifax) laid before the House, Report on the State of the Militia of the Dominion of Canada for the year 1877.

MR. CARTWRIGHT laid before the House, statements of payments charged to unforeseen expenses under Orders in Council from the 1st July, 1877, to date, in accordance with the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 1, schedule B.; also, statement of Special Warrants of His Excellency the Governor-General, issued in accordance with the Act 31

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

Victoria, chapter 5, section 35, from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th of February, 1878, inclusive; and statement of allowances and gratuities under the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 4, entitled an Act for the better securing the efficiency of the Civil Service of Canada, by providing for the superannuation of persons employed therein, in certain cases.

MR. TUPPER asked if the hon. the Minister of Finance would lay upon the table, without a formal motion, all Orders in Council relating to the balances of appropriation which had lapsed and had been carried over to the following year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought the statement was in the Public Accounts; if not, he would have it attended to.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

MR. SPEAKER: I find that, according to a strict interpretation of our rule, no petition can be received after to-day, without special permission of the House. Three petitions have been presented to-day, and it will be necessary to move that the rule be suspended and that the petitions be read and received to-day.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought it would be necessary to go a little further than that. He would have made a motion to-day to extend the time for a week, but the rule required the recommendation of a Committee. He proposed in a few moments to ask the House to confirm the nomination of the Standing Orders Committee, and he would ask them to make the recommendation, and then he would move accordingly. He thought the three petitions might be received to-day.

The petitions were read and received.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the statement of the unexpended balances would be found on page 346, Public Accounts, Part II. He fancied that contained all the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) wanted.

PETITIONS FROM FOREIGNERS.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk has drawn my attention to the fact that