

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice by the pair book that the hon. member for Maskinongé (Mr. Legris) has paired with the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Desaulniers); the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) has paired with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Dyer); and the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) has paired with the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier).

Mr. LAVERGNE. That is not correct as far as I am concerned.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. I refuse to pair with any one.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read the pair book.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this in order?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have nothing to do with any pairs. I must declare the motion as carried or lost according to the vote in the House, and I declare this motion carried.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I paired with the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas).

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Cleveland) has not voted.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I paired with the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. AMYOT. The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Seriver) has not voted.

Mr. SCRIVER. I paired with the hon. member for the West Riding of Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson).

Mr. OUMET. Although, Mr. Speaker, your ruling is quite right, when you say that you have nothing to do with the pairs, still, I think it is well that the House should know how this pairing business works. When an hon. member has paired with another he ought to be sure, when he leaves the House, that his vote will not be lost to his party by the member with whom he has paired voting in favour of his own party.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Let the pairs go on record.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand the hon. gentleman moves the adjournment in view of the critical condition of the Premier?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To-morrow is a Government day; do the Government propose to go on with their business, and if so, what business?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is impossible for us to say now what business will be taken to-morrow. We have a report that Sir John is very low, and we cannot say what may take place before the House meets to-morrow. If we proceed, we will go on with Supply.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what we have a right to know. The hon. gentleman is aware that there is a motion on the paper censuring

Sir Charles Tupper. That, I presume, will proceed at once, if the hon. gentlemen go on with any business at all. That ought to be understood?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we go into Supply, of course that motion will come up first. But we may take a Bill or two before we go into Supply.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. LARIVIÈRE moved:

That the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House be now concurred in.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Secretary of State to the manner in which the French version of the Debates is published and distributed in this House. The House has been sitting for over a month, and although the French version of the Debates is supposed to be published at the same time as the English version, or very soon after, such is not the case. The English Debates have been distributed up to 29th May, and form a volume of 638 pages, while the French version is only up to 13th May, and gives us only 191 pages of translation. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that the French version becomes utterly useless: and unless measures are immediately taken for having the French of the Debates not only translated and printed, but also distributed in this House as promptly as circumstances will allow, that is to say, three or four days after the English version, the French members will find themselves in a position of intolerable inferiority. Indeed, the Debates are, in that way, becoming completely useless to them in the House and for distribution in the constituencies for the information of the electors. I do not know where the fault lies. The translators hold that they follow the English version closely, and the printers hold that they print the French copy as soon as it comes. But one thing is certain, the members get the French version only two or three weeks after the English version has been distributed. This is a matter which, to a large extent, depends on the Department of the hon. Secretary of State, and I particularly draw his attention to these facts, in order that he may take steps to bring about an efficient and immediate remedy to the grievance.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it were a matter dependent on my own diligence, I must say that the request of the hon. gentleman, that the French translation of the Debates should be distributed not later than a couple of days after the English publication, would be immediately attended to. Hon. gentlemen, perhaps, do not realize exactly the difficulty of publishing the French version. We all know that

more than nine-tenths of the business of the House is done in English, and consequently the translating staff is constantly employed translating the Debates. That translation, to be correct, must be read over and revised, so as to obtain uniformity in the translation; for, while several translations might all be correct, yet there might be difference in style, which would lessen the character of the work as a whole. I believe it was understood that the chief of the translating staff should perform the duty of first reading the copy and revising at least one proof: but, as I stated last year, it was found utterly impossible, physically, for the chief translator to read even the first copy of the work of eight translators and do the work correctly. There is not a man who has been editor of a paper who will not understand that it is impossible for one man to read properly the copy of eight translators day by day. I understand that Mr. Beaulieu, who is a hard-working, painstaking man, has had to work at times sixteen hours a day in the endeavour to read over the copy so as to send it to the printing office the next day. Last year I was told that the Printing Bureau should have good proof-readers to revise the copy; but that is not their business; they correct errors of printing, but not the style of the writer. The revise must be read again in order to correct errors which might, by inadvertence, have been committed in the translation—not by the printer or the proof-reader, but by the translator. Last year there was a request for further assistance to Mr. Beaulieu. That request has been repeated this year. Mr. Beaulieu has done his best, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to do that work of reading over the copy of eight translators and then checking the revise. There is a report of the committee, I understand, recommending that an assistant be appointed, which recommendation I hope will meet with the approval of the House, and the grievance complained of by the hon. member for Berthier remedied.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I can corroborate in every particular the remarks of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil). Three or four times during last session I have complained of the time it required for the French translation. There may be differences of opinion on the usefulness of the official publication of the Debates; but whatever opinion one may have in this respect, there is one point on which every one must agree: that is, that if it is expected that the Debates shall have any usefulness at all, they must be published as soon as possible after they have taken place. I need not ask the hon. members of this House what they think of a debate published in French a month and a month and a half—last year the delay was six weeks—after it has taken place. As well give mustard after dinner, as the French saying goes. The thing is absolutely useless. Nobody minds them. They are kept as a kind of ammunition which may come handy in the case of elections, and if no elections come they serve no purpose. It is money utterly lost, to publish the French version of the Debates so long after the English. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not gainsay what the hon. Secretary of State says of the work entailed by the revision of the translation. I admit, with him, that it is impossible for a chief translator alone to revise all the translation

which may be done in a day by four or five translators—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By eight translators.

Mr. LANGEЛИER. By eight official translators. I know that such a thing is absolutely impossible, and I believe it should not be undertaken. I speak without very much experience in the matter, but I believe we cannot expect that from the chief translator. I think that his work should not consist of the constant revision of all the translation done by the different translators, but that he should simply, from time to time, revise the work of each of the translators to see if they are competent. I have not the slightest doubt but that some of the translators are altogether incompetent, or are very negligent, if I judge from their work. Every one knows the Italian proverb: *Traduttore, traditore*, "A translator, a traitor." This proverb has found its application in the case of the translation of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Laurier) on the Address. I call the attention of my hon. friends who know French, to this masterpiece of bad translation. It is such a translation as one reads in patent medicine advertisements. I will quote only one word of it, to give an idea of the manner in which it was done. The hon. leader of the Opposition, referring, if I remember well, to the fact that European mails were now sent by way of the United States, said: "Treason is rampant on the other side of the House." Now, does any one wish to know how this was rendered? This is the way the translator puts it: "*La trahison est rampante de l'autre côté de la chambre.*" "Treason is crawling on the other side of the House." It is an absurdity. It is absolutely the reverse of what my hon. friend said. I lay no blame on the chief translator. But he must be in a position to put an end to this state of things, for really it is no benefit to the French-speaking members to have such a French translation. If, perchance, this speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition was to be read on the other side of the ocean by persons knowing French, they would surely say: "In the name of heaven, who is the Iroquois speaking such a language? It is not French which is spoken in Canada, but a kind of English badly turned into French." And they would surely form a poor opinion of us. Mr. Speaker, I hold that if we pay such large sums to secure the rights of the French language, these rights should be secured effectually. A translation as badly done as that which I have spoken of, not only is of no advantage to the French race, but is altogether to its disadvantage. I draw the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Official Report of the Debates to the manner in which the translation is made. I repeat it: it is not French that we are given. Sometimes and often enough we are given a mixture of French and English, English with French terms. It would be better, in my mind, to be content with the English text alone than to have such a translation made.

Motion agreed to.

SCRIP FOR MILITIA ENGAGED IN NORTH-WEST OUTBREAK.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON moved that on Friday next the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. Resolved, That, whereas the persons hereinafter mentioned and described, being "members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged and bearing arms in the suppression of the Indian and Half-breed outbreak," within the meaning of the Act passed in the session held in the 48th and 49th years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 73, as amended by the Act passed in the session held in the 49th year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 29, have not as yet received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted, and the time within which, under the provisions of the said amended Act, they might have received the same has elapsed; and there may be other persons in the like case; it is desirable that authority should be given for the granting to such persons, notwithstanding anything in the said amended Act contained, of the bounties thereby contemplated.

2. Resolved, That notwithstanding any limits of time in the said amended Act prescribed, the Minister of the Interior be authorized to grant free homesteads or scrip to the persons hereinafter mentioned or described, upon warrants, in favour of such persons respectively, issued by the Minister of Militia and Defence, as provided in the said amended Act: provided that any person in whose favour such warrant is issued, or his duly constituted substitute, shall, within six months after the date of the issue of such warrant, select and make entry for the two quarter-sections to which he is entitled thereunder, and shall thereafter perfect such entry and reside upon and cultivate the lands so entered for in accordance with the terms and conditions prescribed by the Homestead provisions of *The Dominion Lands Act*.

3. Resolved, That any person may, in lieu of such land, take scrip, as provided by the said amended Act, but that any person choosing to take scrip must notify the Minister of the Interior of his choice within six months from the issue of the warrant in his favour.

4. Resolved, That all the provisions of the said amended Act shall, so far as the same are applicable, extend and apply to grants of land and scrip issued under the foregoing provisions.

5. Resolved, That the foregoing provisions shall apply to:

(a) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Regina Volunteer Company;

(b) Members of the corps known during the outbreak as the Battleford Home Guards;

(c) Walter William Phelan, of Regina, a scout actively engaged during the outbreak, whose services have been certified to by competent authority;

(d) The following members of the troop of scouts known as the Steele Scouts, that is to say:—James Rolland, Frederick Rolland, William Rolland, John Whiteford, R. E. Steele, G. M. Steele, W. Chamberlayne, Peter Nelson, George Beatty and John Calder;

(e) Such other persons as hereafter establish to the satisfaction of the Minister of Militia and Defence that they were respectively, within the meaning of the said amended Act, members of the enrolled Militia force actively engaged in bearing arms in the Indian and Half-breed outbreak, and that they have not received the land or scrip by the said amended Act authorized to be granted.

Motion agreed to.

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. TARTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to a motion which was made on my behalf by the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) on the 5th of May last. My hon. friend moved in my name for all papers and correspondence in connection with the awarding of the contract of the Kingston Graving Dock. It is a month since those papers were asked for, and I have not yet heard anything about them. I wish to warn the hon. Minister of Public Works that I have been informed—accurately informed, I believe—that the same fraudulent practices, which have taken place during the last eight or ten years in connection with other contracts in his department, have taken place in connection with this contract. I wish to tell him before the House and before the country that I believe I have the complete proof of money having been paid to men in connection with his department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

ment to obtain information on which Messrs. Michael and Nicholas Connolly, witnesses heard this morning before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, based their calculations to obtain that contract, although they were not the lowest tenderers. I hope that the hon. Minister will see that these papers are brought down as soon as possible, because the experience we have had to-day before the Committee on Privileges and Elections proves that, if we have delay, witnesses and papers may disappear.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order in referring to anything which took place before a committee.

Mr. TARTE. I am perfectly willing to bow to your decision, but I am through.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers the hon. gentleman has mentioned are being prepared in the department. I am writing now to the deputy of my department to ask if they will be ready to-morrow, or when they will be ready.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution respecting the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company be received.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I understood that the hon. gentleman intended, before the report was received, to have laid before the House a list of the shareholders in that undertaking. It was strenuously pressed by my hon. friend from Queen's, and I understood that the list would be forthcoming before the report would be received.

Mr. FOSTER. I said there was no objection to laying the list before the House. I have had it cabled for, and it will be here probably in ten days, which will be in ample time before the Bill passes through the House. What I desire now is to have the resolution passed and the Bill introduced, so that it may be printed and considered by members of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will not proceed with the Bill until this list is produced?

Mr. FOSTER. I think we will have it within ten days.

Report received, resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) to amend the Acts respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY--THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Foster, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," and the motion of Mr. Laurier in amendment thereto.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). When the House adjourned on Friday night, we were discussing the attitude of Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner of this Dominion to England, and the attitude of Sir Charles Tupper as a political bulldozer during the last Dominion election and since the

last Dominion election. The charges preferred by the leader of the Opposition against Sir Charles Tupper, are three, clear, distinct, concise. He is charged with having interfered in the elections while he occupied the high and distinguished position of High Commissioner to England; he is charged with having characterized the Liberal party with being actuated by treasonable and disloyal motives; he is charged, thirdly, with having improperly and unnecessarily interfered with the Grand Trunk Railway, and with having used his position in England since the election, to interfere with the Grand Trunk Railway. He was defended by the Minister of Justice, not, in my judgment, in the broad and generous spirit that one statesman ought to defend another statesman, but rather in the character of an attorney defending a criminal accused of petty larceny, first declaring that the evidence did not satisfy the charge, that the evidence was not strong enough, and then he made a strong appeal to the jury, the gentlemen behind him practically cracking over their heads the ministerial whip and begging of them to vote down the motion of the leader of the Opposition, to vote it down whether the evidence established the guilt of the implicated individual, or whether it did not. The Minister of Justice denied the charges, but he submitted no proof that Sir Charles Tupper denied them. He knew, everybody knew throughout the length and breadth of this wide Dominion, that Sir Charles Tupper had been so charged in the press, at least two months before the charges were levelled against him upon the floor of Parliament. The Minister of Justice knew it. The Minister of Justice is in daily communication, I apprehend, or at all events, may be, with the High Commissioner in England, and yet, although the Minister of Justice denies that Sir Charles Tupper made use of the language that is charged against him, he does not produce before Parliament and the people of Canada a tittle of evidence that Sir Charles Tupper himself denied it. We have the denial of the Minister of Justice, we have no denial from Sir Charles Tupper, and it is not a violent assumption that Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner to England, has known for the last two months, at all events, that those charges were bandied about, both in the English press and in the Canadian press, scattered broadcast all over the world, and yet, so far as we know, the mouth of Sir Charles Tupper is closed, and his lips have been sealed upon this question. The Minister of Justice denied the charges, with the hon. gentleman's usual ability; and perhaps it was to be expected that he would defend his old patron, and the one that warmed him into political life. But altogether I submit to this Parliament, confidently, and to the people of this country, that the defence made by the Minister of Justice was an exceedingly lame defence. The Minister of Justice denied that Sir Charles Tupper had ever called the Liberal party or the leaders of the Liberal party, "ruined gamblers." But Sir Charles Tupper has never made a denial, that I am aware of, either through the Canadian press or through the English press, or by communications to the Minister of Justice. We are asked in this Parliament to take the statement of the Minister of Justice that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no such language. However much confidence I may have in the Minister of Justice, I prefer having the denial from the

individual implicated, that he made use of no such language. The Minister of Justice says that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no such language. I believe the testimony is beyond all reasonable doubt, that Sir Charles Tupper, after the elections were over, if not pending the elections, described the leaders of the great Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada, as "ruined gamblers." How dare Sir Charles Tupper or anybody else stigmatize men that are infinitely better than he is, men whose shoe latches he never was worthy to unloose, as "ruined gamblers?" If the charge is established, as I believe I will be able to establish it—at all events submit evidence in corroboration of the evidence submitted by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that Sir Charles Tupper stigmatized the leaders of the Liberal party as "ruined gamblers"—that it is true is manifest from the echo upon the other side of the House.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I proved that Sir Charles Tupper did not use such language towards the leaders of the Liberal party.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I heard nothing in the hon. gentleman's speech except some stale extracts from stale speeches of the member for South Oxford, that did not appear to me to have any application to, or any bearing whatever upon, the guilt or the innocence of Sir Charles Tupper. Has Sir Charles Tupper himself denied the charge that has been levelled against him? Sir, we are able to produce proof from Conservative papers—and I hope hon. gentlemen will take the utterances of their own organs and of the English papers—that he made use of such language: again I say, how dare Sir Charles Tupper make use of such language?—a gentleman that is known in Parliament and known from one end of the country to the other, throughout his long political life, as having a record of boodle and plunder, from the hour when he first touched the Spring Hill Coal Mine until the hour when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, and he became an English Baronet and a Canadian millionaire. And yet we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that Sir Charles Tupper used no such language. Let us see what the *Montreal Star*, which I do not think is at all favourable to the Liberal party but whose sympathies are with the Conservative party, said regarding the use of this language by Sir Charles Tupper. The *Star* said:

"Sir Charles Tupper gives the parting shot in a letter in the *Times* to-day in the Tyler discussion. He says in this letter that Sir Henry Tyler, like a cuttle-fish, endeavours to escape under the cover of an inky cloud. Sir Charles asserts that it is now proved that the Grand Trunk went to shameful extremes to aid 'ruined gamblers' in attempting to subvert British institutions in Canada. Sir Charles hopes, he says, that the Grand Trunk may yet be redeemed from its miserable, ruinous mismanagement."

Does the Minister of Justice still declare that Sir Charles Tupper never made use of the language? If so, the Minister can obtain abundant proof from the papers published in the locality where the language was uttered. I never heard Sir Charles Tupper make use of this language, but that he did make use of it appears to be reasonably clear from the evidence submitted. Whether Sir Charles Tupper is really a ruined gambler or not, I know not; but this I know, that his political career for twenty-five years shows him to be anything but a ruined gambler. For a quarter of a century he was a member of Parliament, a member of the Government, or ruling

the Government of the country. He was not a millionaire a quarter of a century ago when he came to this Parliament. He left Canada a year or two ago, as I have already intimated, an English baronet and a reputed Canadian millionaire. Everybody knows that a member of Parliament cannot become a millionaire on his sessional allowance, and that a member of the Government cannot become a millionaire within a few years out of his official salary, if he discharges his duty as a member of the Government and an occupant of the Treasury benches. If a gigantic fortune cannot be acquired in that way, how can it be acquired?—echo answers, how? Canada will be startled some day to know the means whereby Canadian statesmen acquire English baronetcies, and even English peerages, and at the same time become Canadian millionaires. I do not care how Sir Charles Tupper acquired his fortune or his baronetcy. All I say is, that it is exceedingly improper, injudicious and unwise for a man occupying the position Sir Charles Tupper occupies, to interfere, directly or indirectly, with Dominion elections: exceedingly injudicious, occupying the position he occupies as a sort of ambassador from the court at Ottawa to the Imperial Court at St. James, to dabble in anything outside of his office. He is sent there, not by the Conservative party, but as the representative of the whole people of Canada, one-half of whom, if not more, are Liberals: his office salary is not taken out of the pockets of the Conservative party, but it is paid by Canadian taxpayers, and Sir Charles Tupper, or anyone else occupying a position of that kind, ought to remain quiescent, and, if he does not do so, it is the duty of this Parliament, if the Government will not muzzle him, to muzzle him. One is curious, when such language is made use of, to know exactly the political record of the utterer of the language while he was a member of Parliament: one is curious to know the opinions which his political adversaries, as well as his political friends, held regarding him: one is curious to know the record of a gentleman who ventures on a public platform to denounce his political adversaries as "ruined gamblers," and to know what his own friends think about him. I will venture to read from the Debates of Parliament some years ago an opinion given of the High Commissioner to England by a gentleman who sat beside him in the councils of the Dominion, who was one of his old adversaries in the old Province of Nova Scotia, when Sir Charles Tupper was Provincial Secretary of that colony, and one of his colleagues here. What this Minister said of Sir Charles Tupper is in the following words:—

"But the picture, dark as it is, has something blacker still. I see there standing in the background, the Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia privately handing over to this same engineer a contract for the whole work. I see him shroud it in darkness and bury it for months in the grave of secrecy. And now the Provincial Secretary comes forward and tells us it was so hidden to serve the public interest; to enable Sandford Fleming, after he had taken the contract, to make better terms with the old contractors: to grind a few more dollars out of them. Public interest indeed! Mr. Sandford Fleming's interest alone. Sir, I know not what term to apply to such conduct in a Government. I know not what to call it—I shall not venture an opinion; but in private life it is called extorting money under false pretences, and our laws make it indictable knavery."

That is pretty strong language, but it was uttered by a Nova Scotian, in regard to a Nova Scotian Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

who was formerly Provincial Secretary. He is not satisfied with that, but he goes on to say:

"They have heard of men riding in public conveyances with a loose mantle about them and a pair of false hands folded in front to lull suspicion, while the real hands were finding their way into their fellow travellers' pockets, and they now think that when the hon. gentleman put on the mantle of Herbert Huntingdon and the old Reformers, the hands he put to the plough were not real—that the real hands were hidden that they might better get to the arm-pits in the public chest, and they wait, they long for the opportunity to sweep him from his position. Therefore, Sir, there was no necessity to bring this case here to excite public opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, if having brought it for investigation, in the discharge of a public duty, what if the people should, on an examination of it, decide that the public interests have been bartered away and betrayed—that the man whom they once believed in as the apostle of retrenchment has become the great high priest of jobbery and corruption? Who then shall restrain limits to their just indignation as they take him, loaded down as he may be with the share of the offerings that fall to the priest, and impale him on the horns of the altar at which he ministers?"

Those were the words made use of by a one time colleague of Sir Charles Tupper: and yet this man has the brazen impertinence to charge the Liberal party with being a set of ruined gamblers. The Minister of Justice desired to convince this House that Sir Charles Tupper made use of no improper or undue influence respecting the Grand Trunk Railway. Sir Charles Tupper, as the Minister of Justice desires us to believe, approached the Grand Trunk Railway in the innocence and simplicity of his nature. He informed the General Manager, in the innocence and simplicity of his character, of his innocent mission. He interviewed some of the prominent employés of the Grand Trunk Railway, simply as an individual, and not as Sir Charles Tupper, seeking the assistance of the Grand Trunk Railway: he simply asked them to stay their hand and not to take violent action against the Government of Canada; he simply asked them to allow their employés to do, and act, and vote just as they liked. Now, does any man believe that, who has known Sir Charles Tupper for twenty-five years as a politician, who now knows Sir Charles Tupper as a political partisan, and who knows the ways and methods of Sir Charles Tupper upon the public platform and during an election campaign? I do not think the Minister of Justice will get many people to believe that story, even assuming that there was no evidence to the contrary. Does any man who knows Sir Charles Tupper and who has known him for ten or fifteen years, believe that he went to the General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway and that all that he asked him to do was to stay his hand. Does any one believe that, in face of the absolute declaration of that General Manager that Sir Charles Tupper wanted him to interfere actively on behalf of the Government? Does any man who knows Sir Charles Tupper for the last fifteen or twenty years believe any such thing? Ah! Mr. Speaker, we do not forget in the olden days the methods of Sir Charles Tupper; we do not forget the famous telegram to Pembroke in 1882, pending a general election, when the people of Pembroke were led to believe that if they voted for the Government candidate they would be relieved of \$70,000 due the Government, and of which they were subsequently relieved. I do not think that the Minister of Justice was in Parliament at that time, but I do think that if he knew much about the methods of Sir Charles Tupper he would not, in his

innocence and simplicity and superabundant confidence in Sir Charles Tupper, have made the statement which he did. Have we forgotten the campaign of 1887; have we forgotten the raids made by Sir Charles Tupper upon the eastern Provinces in 1887? Sir, if we have forgotten them, the Dominion treasury will not forget them for many years. We know perfectly well that upon that occasion Sir Charles Tupper pledged the credit of this country to the expenditure of enormous sums of money, and we know just as well that the Parliament of this country, controlled by hon. gentlemen opposite, implemented nearly every one of these promises. We have not forgotten that, later on, Sir Charles Tupper bullied and bulldozed through Parliament a scheme for the construction of a railway parallel to an existing line of railway, upon his assurance to Parliament that it would shorten the distance to a given point by forty when it only shortened it by five or six miles. We have not forgotten the methods of Sir Charles Tupper in the old parliamentary days when he forced through Parliament a scheme for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon the solemn assurances that it would not cost the people of this country a single cent, and yet the people of this country have to pay every farthing of the cost. We have not forgotten that in those days he assured us that there would be a population of half a million in the North-West Territories by this time; we have not forgotten the glowing picture which he drew of the North-West Territories, and how he pointed out that in a few years the North-West Territories would be able to produce six hundred and forty million bushels of wheat for export; we have not forgotten that he told us that the Dominion Lands in the North-West would pay every farthing of the cost of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we know now, that instead of paying every farthing of that expenditure, we are nearly a million and a half of dollars behind for the management of the North-West lands alone. We are asked, in the face of all this, to believe that this simple and innocent man went out upon this simple and innocent mission, saying to the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway in gentle tones: "Stay your hand, Mr. Seargeant; do nothing, do not interfere with the Government; your men are all in favour of the Government now, and let them vote as they wish." These are not the methods of Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Charles Tupper had a different mission, and Sir Charles Tupper attempted to carry out a different mission, and he failed in his mission because the Grand Trunk Railway Company had made up its mind to remain neutral between the contending parties and to let them fight their own battles. Herepath's *Railway Journal*, speaking of Sir Charles Tupper's conduct, says:

"Shame and amazement must be the predominant feelings in judging of Sir Charles Tupper's scandalous attack on Sir Henry Tyler and the Grand Trunk management generally. * * * but if anything could make us believe that the charges against the Liberal party in Canada are baseless and only made to serve the party ends of the Conservatives, it would be Tupper's abuse of the Grand Trunk for not accepting his corrupt offers."

The *Shareholder* of Montreal also refers to the subject. I do not think the *Shareholder* is a Liberal paper, but, I believe, if it has any politics at all, it has Conservative leanings. The *Shareholder* says:

"Canada's High Commissioner should not bring discredit on the country by exhibiting so much rancour and rashness. He is the paid servant of the country, and as such should let politics alone. His conduct in the matter has been simply indecent."—

That is the opinion of a non-partizan paper. It goes on to say:

—"and the sooner his employers silence him the better it will be for Canadian interests."

So say I, Mr. Speaker. Whatever be the politics of the man who penned this article, he says right when he says that the sooner the Government of this country muzzles Sir Charles Tupper and keeps him clear of politics and other interference with Canadian interests, the better it will be for this country. But Sir Charles Tupper has not only attempted to interfere with the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, but he charged that great corporation, as the extracts I have read show, with extravagance, jobbery and corruption. He was speedily brought to book for that, and he backed down to some extent by saying that this extravagance, jobbery and corruption was perpetrated during the construction and under the early management. Why, Sir Charles Tupper had been in Parliament for nearly twenty-five years, except when he was lording it as High Commissioner in England, and for all these long years the Grand Trunk Railway had intimate relations with Sir Charles Tupper, and Sir Charles Tupper had intimate relations with the Grand Trunk Railway managers, and yet he never said a word about that extravagance, jobbery and corruption. So long as the Grand Trunk Railway was prepared to subserve the interest of Sir Charles Tupper or the Government of which he was a prominent supporter, or member, so long as the Grand Trunk Railway did nothing more than give the Government their sympathy and indirect support, the Grand Trunk Railway was not guilty of extravagance, jobbery or corruption, but the moment the Grand Trunk Railway ceased to serve the interests of the political party to which Sir Charles Tupper belonged, then, in the eyes of Sir Charles Tupper, the Grand Trunk Railway was guilty of extravagance, jobbery and corruption. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House, does Sir Charles Tupper realize thoroughly the damage he is doing to this country by so talking of a company such as the Grand Trunk Railway—a company that this country will be forever indebted to, a company that has done more to open up and to develop the resources of this country than all the Tupperes that have ever lived, or all the Tupperes that will live until the Day of Judgment? Does Sir Charles Tupper realize the damage he is doing to Canadian interests; does he not know that in the city of London where he lives, there are thousands of investors who have their little all invested in the Grand Trunk Railway; and yet Sir Charles Tupper openly declares that the Grand Trunk Railway is managed by extravagance, jobbery and corruption. Does he realize the damage that he is doing Canadian interests by so declaring, or does he realize that by interfering in politics at all he is damaging Canadian interests. If he does not realize all this, it is high time that the Government should recall him, and if the Government does not recall him, it is high time that the Parliament of Canada should muzzle Sir Charles Tupper. Let me read what the *Railway News* wrote of Sir Charles Tupper. It says:

"If, by any means, they—[the Grand Trunk managers]—could have succeeded, then many of the friends of Sir Charles would not have had the opportunity of being numbered amongst the wealthiest of Canadians; and if they had failed, as they assuredly would, for lack of that support, which has been so lavishly given to the friends and supporters of the Government in Canada, the proprietors of the Grand Trunk would have had occasion to lament, even ten times more bitterly than they now do, the disastrous results of the confidence which they reposed in the promises and pledges of the Canadian Government—among others, that the line would pay 11 per cent. upon its capital, and that it should be practically free from that railway competition which has of late years been so recklessly encouraged."

I also read from Herepath's *Railway Journal* the following extract with regard to the charge of extravagance, corruption and jobbery:—

"We on this side have a much better opportunity of judging of the ability and honesty of the Grand Trunk management than has Sir Charles Tupper, and we can tell him that it has been characterized by sterling honesty, prudent foresight, and the best form of conservatism."

It is a pity, Mr. Speaker, that we could not introduce into Canada a little of the best form of conservatism. Now, I shall vote heartily for the resolution of my hon. friend. I believe the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper is wholly without justification; I believe his active interference at all in politics is wholly without justification; and had the motion of my hon. friend gone further than it does, I would have voted for it; I would have voted to abolish the office and to abolish Sir Charles Tupper at the same time. I never could see the utility or necessity for this office. I see it now less than I ever saw it before. Every hour, I think, gives us convincing proof that the office itself is wholly unnecessary. When that office was created we were informed by the Administration that it was created for certain purposes. The Commissioner was to act as the representative and resident agent for Canada in England, and was to exercise such powers and perform such duties as might be assigned to him by the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council was to direct him what to do. He was to supervise immigration; he was to carry out the instructions he might receive from the Governor in Council respecting the financial, commercial and general interests of Canada. Now, I would like the Government to point out to this House what Sir Charles Tupper has ever done in the general interests of Canada; I would like them to point out to me a single Order in Council that they have passed giving Sir Charles Tupper directions to do something for the general benefit of the people of this great country. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice, who has taken up the hopeless task of defending Sir Charles Tupper, was it by Order in Council that, in 1884, Sir Charles Tupper was induced to abandon his mission to England, to leave the charmed circle on the outskirts of aristocratic life there and come to Canada, and take his place in the Government and the House, and bully through Parliament a large additional subvention to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company? Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice if it was by Order in Council that, in 1888, Sir Charles Tupper again came to Canada, and again occupied a seat on the Treasury benches, and forced another subvention to his masters the Canadian Pacific Railway Company through Parliament. Let me ask the hon. Minister of Justice, was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper lent the influence of his

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

name and position as High Commissioner to his dear friend Mr. Isaacs in order to establish the Dead Meat Company at the charming city of Three Rivers, by which thousands of English investors were induced to put their money into this enterprise, and lost it? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper was brought, in 1891, from his mission to England, where he is supposed to be of such invaluable service to the people of Canada, in order to take part in the heat and turmoil of a political contest in this country? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper appeared on a public platform in the city of Quebec, and, for the purpose of carrying a constituency or two, pledge the credit of his country to a million of money? I do not know whether he did that or not, because I was not there; but I will read an extract from the *Quebec Chronicle*, which I am told is a Conservative paper. Hear what it says:—

"Sir Charles spoke some hopeful words for the bridge. But he was also most emphatic on the old North Shore Railway bonds question. He stated to his enthusiastic audience, which applauded almost every sentence that he uttered, that the Canadian Pacific Railway could be relieved of that \$1,000,000 worth of obligation without its costing the country at large one cent."

It is the old, old story: you can assume a liability, involving the expenditure of millions of money, and yet it will not cost the tax-payers a cent. Sir Charles Tupper is full of promises.--

"The High Commissioner painted a beautiful picture, full of roses and things. He said that elevators would be erected, that grain in enormous quantities would be shipped from here, and that the Government would do its part manfully to help forward the Quebec boom. Sir Charles then read a telegram, which came hot from the wires, from the Premier of Canada."

There you have the assurance of Sir Charles Tupper on the public platform. Were these given on the faith of an Order in Council passed by the Governor General in the presence of his advisers? Was it by Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper went to Montreal and attempted to bulldoze the Grand Trunk Railway Company to coerce their employés to vote for the Government party? Was it by an Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper was instructed to assume an attitude calculated to strike a fatal blow at the credit of this country in the English market? Is it by an Order in Council that Sir Charles Tupper has been acting in the way he has been doing for the last three or four years? If so, then all I can say is, that by virtue of an Order in Council Sir Charles Tupper's conduct has been offensive and insulting to a large majority of the people of Canada, and I believe, also, to a great many people in the mother country. If Sir Charles Tupper must engage in politics, let him resign his office. I have no objection to Sir Charles Tupper taking the field in the Canadian political arena, if he must dabble in politics on behalf of his political friends on the other side of the House; but if he does so, let him resign his office. Do not let him remain as the ambassador of Canada to the Imperial Court and draw a salary amounting, with those of his employés, to about \$25,000 a year, and at the same time act as a political partisan or a political bully and bulldozer from one end of this country to the other. And if the Government do not wish to check him, then the Parliament of Canada ought to check him; and if Parliament does not do so, the people of this country will do so when they get an opportunity. Who ever heard of an English ambassador inter-

fering in the politics of a foreign court? We know of one celebrated instance, when an English ambassador wrote a political letter during the heat of a political campaign in the United States, and no sooner was that letter drawn to the attention of the Imperial Government than that ambassador was recalled. Our ambassador engages in all kinds of schemes in England, in waterworks and gas manufacturing industries, and then slanders and abuses people and institutions in this country. I say it is high time the people of this country should put a stop to Sir Charles Tupper's conduct. He is not only a useless appendage to the body politic, but he is a mischief and a nuisance to Canada and in England. He serves no good purpose there; and besides all that, he is an exceedingly expensive ornamental figure-head at the Court of St. James. I find that this great man, who, if we are to believe the hon. the Minister of Justice, deserves rather the commendation of the whole people of Canada than the condemnation of the right-thinking people of this Dominion, is paid by us a salary of \$10,000 a year and \$2,000 allowance. We pay about \$13,000 for his employes, and I suppose we pay his travelling expenses. Even when he takes up his gripsack and goes to Spain to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, in the pleasant season of the year, or when he comes to Canada to engage in a political contest, we have no doubt to foot the bill. And besides all this, we have to pay his gas bill. And we are charged a gratuity paid by him to Mrs. Wilkinson, of \$68. If our High Commissioner chooses to be generous and charitable to Mrs. Wilkinson, is that any business of ours, and why should we be called on to pay for his generosity? We are also called on to pay his gratuities to postmen and others. But if Sir Charles Tupper chooses to give ten cents or twenty-five cents or a dollar to the small boy who brings his letters, I ask is it not an outrage that the tax-payers of this country should be called on to pay it? We provide him with a freehouse and free furniture, and yet we have to pay his income tax of \$250 a year and other taxes. I suppose that every hon. member in this House pays his own taxes. I suppose that the officials pay their own taxes out of their own pockets. Why, then, should we make an exception in favour of Sir Charles Tupper, even though he be an English baronet and Lord High Commissioner to England? Why should we pay our ambassador's railway tickets, and his newspaper bill amounting to \$196.04, and his parochial rates \$349.47, and his portorage? If the High Commissioner cannot carry his own gripsack but chooses to employ a porter, why should we pay for that? Yet we are charged \$5.47 for it. Why should we pay his subscription to Ashburnham Gardens, \$10.95, and to the Colonial Institute, \$9.73? One has only to read those items, in the light of the information we get from the Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts, to be amazed that any Government, even this, should be so utterly reckless of what is due the tax-payers of this country, as to sanction the payments of these large sums. I will vote for the motion, and if my hon. friend had introduced a Bill to abolish the office of High Commissioner, it would have received my cordial support. I think it is the bounden duty of the Parliament, if the Government is, as usual, recreant to the trust reposed in it by the people of Canada,

to stamp with their disapproval the conduct of the High Commissioner.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend, whom, if he will not think it impertinent on my part, I welcome back to the Parliament of Canada, though I should have preferred, of course, to see in his place my friend Mr. Porter. My hon. friend the member for Huron illustrates the principle of abstention, in which he and I believe. He had too much Porter, and he could not come up to time. The Porter was removed from his locality, and there he is, and I am very glad to see him. As we had to have a Reformer, there is nobody I should prefer seeing here than my hon. friend. Now, the speech of my hon. friend, to which we have just listened, divides itself into three parts. The first part dealt with what might be called the figurative language of Sir Charles Tupper. The next part dealt with the career of Sir Charles Tupper before he became High Commissioner, and a small portion of the close of the speech dealt with him as High Commissioner. Now, for middle-aged men and some past middle age, it seems to me very extraordinary that we should be so sensitive to a phrase—that it should irk the soul of the hon. member for Huron that he and his fellow leaders of the Reform party should be called “ruined gamblers.” What did Sir Charles Tupper mean by that expression? He could not have meant that my hon. friend the member for Huron is given to playing the seductive game of poker and loses heavily. He could not have meant that any of the other leaders, take, for instance, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), were given to that interesting game and lost heavily at it. It is evidently a figurative phrase applied to them as politicians. What could it mean? It could only mean that they had bet on a certain policy and had lost—that they had bet on unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union and had lost. And what then were they but ruined gamblers? But, Sir, still more extraordinary is it that gentlemen so sensitive about a figurative phrase should, in the very breath in which they complain of that phrase, have used also figurative language: for the hon. member for Huron, in the very sentence in which he complained of the phrase “ruined gamblers,” called Sir Charles Tupper a “political bulldozer.” Now, really there is not much difference. If you were to take a pair of scales and weigh the two phrases—if you would put the phrase “ruined gambler” in the one scale and “political bulldozer” in the other, I venture to say they would balance each other almost as nicely as a pair of apothecary scales weighing some infinitesimal prescription. Not only that. My hon. friend left the figurative; he departed from the imaginative field and came to plain language, and he declared that for twenty-five years the career of Sir Charles Tupper had been one of plunder. Well, that is a strong phrase especially coming from gentlemen who are so sensitive about being called “ruined gamblers;” and then my hon. friend cited a quotation from a speech of Mr. Mc Lelan, made in 1876, in the Nova Scotia Parliament, in which he spoke very harshly, and also in a figurative manner, of Sir Charles Tupper. But, Sir, in this very House—I was here at the time—Mr. McLelan, who, I think, was then Finance Minister or Postmaster General, got up and

repudiated all those phrases which have been read out with so much unction by the hon. member for Huron. My hon. friend complained of Sir Charles Tupper's enthusiasm over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the North-West. Sir, I doubt if I should be standing here to-day troubling the House, if it were not for what Sir Charles Tupper has done for the North-West. There is no man in Canada, not even his illustrious leader, to whom the North-West is more indebted than to Sir Charles Tupper. He always believed in the North-West; and, Mr. Speaker, indeed at that time, which was a time of doubt and despondency—and we know very well that amongst Reformers despondency is a disease more common than with Conservatives—we needed an enthusiastic man, a man of eager, burning character like Sir Charles Tupper to give enthusiasm to the people and make them believe in the future of their country. Why, the hon. the leader of the Opposition, when he was speaking of this Canadian Pacific Railway, declared—I was reading it in one of his speeches in a book with which I was presented, and very glad I am to have been presented with a volume containing his speeches—that the idea that the railway could be built in the time within which it was agreed it could be built was preposterous. He declared it would take a much longer time. But Sir Charles Tupper built it in a much shorter time. I think the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) said that all the resources of the Empire would not be sufficient to build that railway in the time it was contracted to be built, but, nevertheless, Sir Charles Tupper built that railway in four years less than the specified time. He is a man of great energy, and that is a great railway, and has made Canada something in the eyes of the world. If the Minister of Justice claims that Sir Charles Tupper has rendered great services to Canada, the building of that railway is not the least he has done in the interest of Canada. Then, it is said he spoke of the Grand Trunk Railway as being given up to jobbery, corruption and extravagance. I know nothing about the jobbery, I know nothing about the corruption, but I do know that the last contest illustrated the extravagance, and, I think, also the corruption of that company. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) complained the other night, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had given some assistance to this Government in the late contest. I do not know whether it did or not, but I do know that throughout one whole division in my constituency—though I am aware since that date that it was without the knowledge or consent of Mr. VanHorne—the whole influence of the Canadian Pacific Railway was used against me. If so, we have here again a specimen of consistency. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) complains of Sir Charles Tupper's figurative language, yet calls him a bulldozer, and these gentlemen, who hold up their hands in holy horror at the action of the Canadian Pacific Railway, had no objection to accept the assistance of the Grand Trunk. I hold in my hand *L'Electeur*, which, I believe, is one of the organs of the leader of the Opposition,

An hon. MEMBER. And a very good paper, too.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, it is a very good paper; I read it frequently. It says here, and I hope hon.

Mr. DAVIN.

gentlemen who speak French will excuse my *accent déplorable*:

"Two Grand Trunk trains, one of twenty-three, the other of twenty-seven cars, arrived yesterday from the United States with Canadian voters. It is calculated that more than 2,000 of our countrymen have come back to Canada to give their vote. The twenty-three car train which arrived at Point Lévis with voters for the Eastern Townships, was drawn by three locomotives. The Grand Trunk had even been generous enough to send locomotives and snow ploughs ahead to clear the track encumbered by the storm. All these brave fellows were unanimous in favour of Mr. Laurier and reciprocity. They were shouting "Vive Laurier!" at every station, and communicated their enthusiasm to the crowd of friends that had come to meet them."

Here is the hon. gentleman himself pictured in this paper, and here is "*La couronne de Laurier*." But they crowned him, they arrayed his brow with laurels in advance. And if I may be allowed to make a pun in his own beautiful language and quote a line from one of the greatest of its writers, they should have remembered that

"*Avec tous vos lauriers craignez encore la foudre.*"

And there was a lightning coming which they did not dream of, and a bolt they were not expecting, and, when the ballots came to be counted, my hon. friend, who, if ever the Reform party should win—which Heaven forbid—I should be more glad to see at the head of the Government of Canada than any other man, found that he was mistaken. I will not go into what might be called the ancient history of the Springhill Mine, or anything of that kind. In fact I know nothing in reference to those matters, and they have nothing to do with this question. We are dealing with Sir Charles Tupper in his acts as High Commissioner of Canada, and he must stand or fall by his acts as High Commissioner of Canada. There is a Latin maxim which says *Qui hæret in literâ hæret in cortice*; that is to say, that anyone who sticks merely to the letter goes only skin deep. Let us not be deceived by the phrase "civil servant." Let us ask the House if there is any strict analogy between the position of Sir Charles Tupper and that of an ordinary civil servant. Is he within the restraints and bonds that bind the ordinary civil servant? Is it not well known that, if the Government changed to-morrow he would go out from his office? It is well known that that would be the case. But let me argue the case, and I will particularly address myself to the leader of the Opposition, because I am going to appeal to him to change his motion. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper was an ordinary civil servant and had no political record at all, we must take the definition of the moral situation from Sir Charles Tupper himself, and what does he say? He declares that, in his opinion, the course the Liberal party was taking, was a disloyal course. That is his opinion, and we have to take it as his honest opinion. When the leader of the Opposition declares, as he does in this House, that he is as loyal as any man of the party to which I belong, I believe him, because I know him to be a gentleman, and I know that he would not say what was not true; I take him at his word. When Sir Charles Tupper declares that the course pursued by the Liberal party was a disloyal course, and was calculated to lead to annexation, we have to suppose that he believes it. In fact we have Mr. Blake expressing the same opinion. He is no longer sitting in this House. Why? Because he came to the conclusion, so far as

I could gather from that letter of his, that somehow or other the policy of the Liberal party, to which he belonged, would lead to annexation. However, we have nothing to do with that, it is merely by the way. We have to take Sir Charles Tupper's words as to what his belief was. Now, suppose he is an ordinary civil servant without any political record. It is known that he is a man of great power on the platform, and the head of the Government he serves sends word to him: "Come over. You are a man of great political power on the platform—come over and help us. According to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), you have luxurious chambers, but still, come over here, we want you to help us. You know what these people, our opponents, are fighting for. They have raised a disloyal cry, and we want you to beat it down." What would be thought of him if he did not obey that call, even supposing he had no political record whatever, once he was told by the head of the Government that he could render his country a service? And if he were a patriotic Canadian, and were honest in his belief, what would be thought of him if he hesitated? I will go further than that, and I will say this: The man is not in that position at all; he is a man with a political record; he is an ex-Minister of the Crown. It is only the other day that he was sitting there where the Finance Minister is now sitting. There is hardly an item of expenditure that has been incurred by this Government during some 14 years, for which he is not responsible. He is responsible for the policy which is the main plank in the platform of the Government at this hour. He fought for it in 1878; he fought for it session after session. He is a Privy Councillor; he is sworn to do all he can, therefore, to secure loyalty to Her Majesty, and so far as he is able, he is bound to preserve the allegiance of this country to Her Majesty. Well, Sir, this man is told that the country is in danger, that the colleagues who sat by his side are in danger, and are fighting for their lives, that the country is in the balance and at stake, and he is asked by the Prime Minister to come over here and fight in the battle that is impending. What would be thought of him, let me ask you, if he looked round on those luxurious chambers of which the member for North Wellington speaks so eloquently and so fondly, and thought to himself: "How can I leave this? How can I leave the luxury of London? How can I leave rubbing elbows with Dukes and Duchesses, and go over to the rough-and-tumble fight of a Canadian election?" But we may even go further than that. We may fancy people near and dear to Sir Charles Tupper coming to him and saying: "You are old; you are no longer what you were; you fight with diminished force; you must feel a lessened force. Why should you go across the Atlantic and leave your duties here, which are important to the country? Why should you go over there to engage in the rough-and-tumble fight of a Canadian election?" If he had any touch of baseness in him you could fancy him hesitating; but I need hardly tell you that that is not the character of the man. I believe he has often been called the war-horse of Cumberland; he is like the war-horse in Job, he "smelleth the battle afar off." And you may be perfectly certain that when he was summoned to come over here to fight in the elections, he did not hesitate for one moment, but he put on his armour, and he took

down his sword: and perhaps I may quote words that indicate a situation not at all unlike, the words Schiller puts into the mouth of Hector when he hears Achilles roaring along the walls of Troy. When the Achilles of the Reform party, the member for South Oxford, was roaring along the walls of our citadel, we can fancy Sir Charles Tupper saying, in these immortal words of Schiller:

"Theures Weib gebiete deine Thränen
Nach der Feldschlacht ist mein feurig Sehnen
Diese Arme schützen Pergamus."

Now, if there are any hon. gentlemen here who do not understand German, I will translate these words, although my translation will be feeble compared with the original:

"Dearest wife, dry your tears.
My heart burns for the battle field;
These arms protect Canada."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that if you look at the situation as described by my hon. friend from North Wellington, will you say that Sir Charles Tupper is a culprit? My hon. friend from North Wellington is an eloquent man, he is a great master of figures, and most eloquent men are great masters of figures. He is a great master of detail—

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Of tails.

Mr. DAVIN,—and he has told us by the hour, on many and many a night, of those luxurious chambers, of the immense and ascending income of Sir Charles Tupper, of the fearful luxury in which he lives. He is a sort of Domitian, surrounded by every kind of abounding luxury. He has told us all this. Well, Mr. Speaker, if Sir Charles Tupper is a civil servant, according to the usual definition of the phrase, and if he imperils all that, for the sake of his belief in Canada, and for the sake of opposing a policy which he regarded as dangerous to the country and disloyal, why, instead of being a culprit, he is a hero.

An hon. MEMBER. Second homestead.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing about the second homestead in this, but when you come up to the North-West we will give you a second homestead and a shack as well. We are told that Sir Charles Tupper's action with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway has a tendency to lower the value of the property and destroy the credit of Canada. Now, I am not at all certain that it may not turn out that Sir Charles Tupper's criticism of the Grand Trunk will be a benefit to the Grand Trunk ultimately—not at all certain but that it may prove so. Well, suppose it should depress. Suppose that his assaults on the Grand Trunk Railway should, for a passing day, lower the value of shares; suppose that be the case, what are we to think of charges like that made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? He does not merely decry one railway enterprise, he decries the whole country with one fell swoop. We have seen *Grip*, that is edited by Mr. Bengough. I know him, and my impression is that he is a Reformer. He is the caricaturist of *Grip*, and the other day there was a cartoon of the member for South Oxford, who was represented as an artist painting a picture of the future of Canada. There was not much light and shadow in the picture, it was all one black daub. That, on the part of a Liberal critic, is the view taken of the future of Canada by one

of the leaders of the Reform party. And yet they condemn Sir Charles Tupper because he uttered some strong language about the Grand Trunk Railway. Suppose Sir Charles Tupper talked of the Grand Trunk Railway with what might be called patriotic fervour, you have to take the position as defined by himself. He regarded the Reform party in that contest as engaged in a struggle that would lead to disloyalty and annexation. If that be so, and the Grand Trunk Railway was assisting them—and I have shown that the Grand Trunk Railway in one place alone brought in 2,000 voters, according to one of their own papers—is it a very extraordinary thing that Sir Charles Tupper, indignant at the course taken by the Grand Trunk Railway, should have used strong language against the company? At all events, it does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen who decry the country, as hon. gentlemen do, to speak very harshly of Sir Charles Tupper for criticizing adversely one company, when they by one fell swoop darkened the whole horizon. One thing that has been referred to in this debate, and I think it is not without being germane to the matter, is the immense sums which it is said those Tupperes have received. I do not know what it means. Sir Charles Tupper has been a Minister of the Crown for a long time; his son has been a Minister of the Crown for some years. No one supposes a Minister of the Crown is overpaid in this country. I agree in what the hon. member for Montreal (Sir Donald Smith) said that both the judges and our Ministers are underpaid. And if men serve their country and are paid for it, is it money taken from the country? I think it is money paid for the equivalent of services received. But my hon. friends ask, what has Sir Charles Tupper done? I say, he has created the High Commissionership as we have it now; I say, just what Lord Dufferin did for the Governor Generalship of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper has done for the High Commissionership in London; I say, he has done more than any man, more than all his predecessors, in bringing Canada before England and Europe, and his conduct in the Colonial and Indian Exhibition placed this country under great obligations to him. But there was one small incident which occurred a few years ago for which we in the North-West Territories are grateful to him, and Canada should be grateful to him also: I allude to the time when our cattle were supposed to be suffering from pleuro-pneumonia. What did he do? He rolled up his sleeves; he is a dissector in more ways than one; he had an animal killed, and it was shown that the cattle were not suffering from pleuro-pneumonia; and that one act was of more value than all the money the Tupperes have ever received from Canada. Look at the live stock trade from Canada to England, and you will find that it reaches more than \$30,000,000 since that. If it had not been for Sir Charles Tupper's energy and resource, and if that report had been allowed to go by the board, we would not have been allowed to send our live cattle to England, but would have been obliged to slaughter them here, and our immense trade in live cattle would have been destroyed. Talk of the services rendered by the High Commissioner. I say, that for his services as High Commissioner, for his services as a Minister of the Crown, if we gave decorations for political services, as they do in England for military services, the breast of Sir Charles Tupper would be covered with

Mr. DAVIN.

stars. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) thought it was beneath the dignity of the High Commissioner to attend to turkeys and eggs. One reason why I admire Sir Charles Tupper is that he attends to our minutest items. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) said he did not; but if the hon. member will read the High Commissioner's report, and watch the daily papers, and see his eternal wakefulness and activity, he will find there is not a single detail of our commercial interests to which Sir Charles Tupper does not attend, and the fact that he looks after our turkeys and eggs, and gives good advice about our not sending them all to Liverpool, but some to London, and thus divide the supply on the market, and furnishes information that is most useful to our farmers and farmers' wives, comes home to our business and our bosoms. I believe that most of the Reform party, in fact I believe all the Reform party, as far as I know its members, are loyal; that is to say, they are subjectively loyal. But objectively, if I may make a distinction known to German metaphysics, they are disloyal. No doubt they mean to be loyal. You can easily understand a man getting on a railroad that would lead to disloyalty and annexation, and yet deceive himself that every sleeper he travelled over was a loyal one, and on every rail there was the hall-mark of devotion to the Empire. Nevertheless the rails would lead him to a disloyal goal. That is the position our friends occupy. When Sir Charles Tupper gets angry with them for being in that position, they must put it down as zeal for his country and zeal for the Empire. I knew a Church of England clergyman, a young man, who was accustomed to get into violent fits of rage. His sisters reproached him, for they were all Christian people, and he said he did not get angry, but he felt righteous indignation. So with Sir Charles Tupper; I think it is righteous indignation. A commercial unionist may deceive himself, and he may think himself loyal, that he could not be a traitor. Natural history brings us into acquaintance with a very interesting animal, the tadpole. It is not a fish, yet it dare not venture on dry land, but the microscope will reveal rudiments of the legs—of the legs to be. It does not require a very powerful political microscopic examination of a commercial unionist to find out the rudiments of those feet that would lead him across the line. In fact, and I do not mean to be offensive, your commercial unionist is a tadpole traitor. To the leader of the Opposition I must say that he cannot possibly ask the House or his own party to vote with him in favour of this motion. The Prime Minister the other night took the whole responsibility for Sir Charles Tupper's action. What could Sir Charles Tupper do when asked to come over? How could he refuse as a chivalrous and honourable man? I do not see how he could have done otherwise, and it seems to me one of the most ungenerous things, one of the most unchivalrous things possible, to bring forward a motion like this condemning a man who was our colleague the other day. You remember that a great Englishman, writing from the Roman forum, said, "The air breathes, burns with Cicero;" and at this very hour, in this very Chamber, you almost hear the echo of Sir Charles Tupper's voice. Are you going to divert all your condemnation against an individual who was bound to take the

action which he did, because, as he tells us, he believed that the enemies he had to fight were pursuing a disloyal course? He was bound in allegiance to his chief and to his colleagues to take that course, and yet you ask us to condemn him. I think I have shown the House that after all there is not much to condemn Sir Charles Tupper for. The chief charge against him, as the Opposition allege, is a figurative phrase which he used, and his remarks about a railway which took a strenuous part in the election. If some hon. gentlemen believe that it was so wrong for the Canadian Pacific Railway to take part in the election, it must be equally wrong for the Grand Trunk Railway, and it was, therefore, a proper thing to denounce it. Now, even supposing Sir Charles Tupper had committed an error, is it a proper thing for members of this Parliament to condemn, because of one error, a man who has done such great services for the country? Why, if Sir Charles Tupper were to fall to-morrow there is not a man in this House who would hesitate for one moment to vote money to build him a statue on these Parliament grounds; and yet we are asked to-day to condemn him as an individual for an action for which the Government is really responsible and for which, if it was a fault, it was a very trifling fault compared with his great services. The hon. the leader of the Opposition is a man of chivalrous character, and he should not ask the House to vote on this motion. Let him withdraw this motion and change it to one condemnatory of the Government for inviting Sir Charles Tupper out here, and then we can discuss it upon broader grounds. I maintain that no chivalrous man can condemn Sir Charles Tupper on the grounds stated, first by the leader of the Opposition, then by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and then by the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). Their chief complaint is that Sir Charles Tupper took part in the election, although it is well known that he is as much a politician now as he ever was; and their next complaint is that he used some figurative language against them, while they at the same time use as strong, and stronger, language about him. The fact is that any man who considers the motion and the arguments which have endorsed it, will place little faith in it, when he remembers it is directed against a man who has rendered great services to Canada, and who, when the history of this young people comes to be written, will be acknowledged as one of the great forces which united and built up this young Canadian nation, stretching from the stormy Atlantic to strands swept by Pacific seas.

Mr. MULOCK. It is not my intention to follow the examples of some who have preceded me, for I shall endeavour, if possible, to confine myself to the issue before the House. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), at the commencement of his speech, pointed to himself as one of the great products of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and if I never before felt grateful to the Government and to the country for having constructed that road, I must now acknowledge my gratitude, because the hon. gentleman has told us that the Parliament of Canada was indebted to the Canadian Pacific Railway for his presence in this House, and when I learned that, I felt that we had in some measure been paid for all our trouble and

expense. Now, with regard to the merits of this question. In my opinion, the defence voiced by the Minister of Justice, who gave the cue to the other speakers on the Government side of the House, is possibly the only one the case admits of. My hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Davin) contended that, out of generosity, this House should not condemn an old colleague, but no one can admit that plea. He contended further that because the High Commissioner was a Privy Councillor that position entitled him to step into the arena of politics. Why, Sir, every day we have examples of Privy Councillors stepping out from the party lines and serving their country in other spheres.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). On the bench.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, on the bench, as my hon. friend from Bothwell says. Is it to be admitted that because a man holds a position as Privy Councillor, he can enjoy all the freedom that had attached to the office held by him at an earlier period? The hon. the Minister of Justice presented as a defence to the House, that the charges against Sir Charles Tupper were not proven. The resolution, he said, charged Sir Charles Tupper with having slandered a portion of the people of Canada and attacked a great institution, and the Minister declared that at no period during the campaign, or subsequent thereto, had the High Commissioner been guilty of this offence. The Minister of Justice stated that he had attended on the platform with Sir Charles Tupper on numerous occasions; and I presume, from his general statement, that he took the responsibility of all the utterances of Sir Charles Tupper, when he declared that at no time had he been guilty of the offences charged. The Minister of Justice, before entering into that general defence, controverted the statement advanced from this side of the House, that the High Commissioner occupied a position somewhat analogous to that of an ambassador. He controverted that proposition and illustrated his opposition to the principle by declaring that the High Commissioner should at all times be in sympathy with the political Government of the day, and to that extent must continue to enjoy and pronounce his political views. Not only that, Sir, but the Minister of Justice declared that the High Commissioner in no way occupied the position analogous to that of ambassador. I will give the House the opinion of another gentleman as to what is the true status of the High Commissioner for Canada. That opinion is as follows:—

"I hold the opinion that a person holding the high office of representative of the Dominion of Canada in England should be as nearly as possible in the position of an ambassador. You know that the British Ministers representing their country abroad do not change with the Government of the day. They remain at their posts discharging the duties allotted to them without reference to what party may be in the ascendancy for the time being." That is the opinion of a high authority.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Who is the authority?

Mr. MULOCK. Sir Charles Tupper is the authority. I am quoting from a speech of Sir Charles Tupper which my hon. friend will find reported in the *Halifax Herald* of the 16th February, 1891. Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

"I felt anxious that the position of High Commissioner should as far as possible be the same, and from the first hour I held that office, when I was not a Cabinet Minister, I carefully abstained from taking any part whatever in party controversy."

Thus you will see that his own view of the office and its duties, for a time at all events, compelled him to conform to the opinion of his duties and responsibilities that we contend for.—

"I looked upon myself, not only as a representative of the Government of the day, but as the representative of all parties and classes in this country, and I was ever ready, as a good many persons can bear witness, to place my best services at the disposal of Canada in whatever way they were required, without reference to party consideration at all."

Sir, these are the words of Sir Charles Tupper himself, and are but echoes of the sentiment expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition in moving this resolution, that it was the duty of the agent-general of Canada at all times to hold his services available for the various interests of Canada, whether affecting the party with which he was in sympathy, or the party opposed to him. With that admission of his, I think I can drop the argument of the hon. Minister of Justice, leaving him to settle that question with the High Commissioner. And now I come to the evidence on the point. The hon. Minister of Justice declares that there is no evidence in support of the charges contained in the resolution. Those charges are as follows:—Sir Charles Tupper is charged with interfering in the recent elections. Is there any evidence in support of that? I am not aware that there has been any evidence; but, I think, it is a matter we can take judicial notice of. Perhaps the hon. Minister will put us to the truth of it; but I will pass over that clause. The High Commissioner is charged with "imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion," and also with "assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and reflecting upon the position of the said company." The hon. Minister of Justice has declared that there is not a tittle of evidence in support of these charges. In regard to the accusations of treasonable conduct, against a portion of the people of Canada, I need not trouble the House with evidence, because that has been supplied by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He stated it as Sir Charles Tupper's excuse for coming to Canada, that Sir Charles Tupper declared that, in his opinion, a large proportion of the people of Canada were disloyal.

Mr. DAVIN. No; the policy proposed.

Mr. MULOCK. That was the defence offered for Sir Charles Tupper by the hon. member: I took down his words. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Charles Tupper had declared that, in his opinion, the course of the Liberal party was a disloyal one, and would lead to annexation.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear; that is it.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for West Assiniboia says that was the excuse for Sir Charles Tupper's conduct. We were told that the request of the right hon. First Minister was the excuse for his conduct. Now, in regard to the charges against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I quote from the speech of the High Commissioner as reported in the *Halifax Herald* of 11th March last. Speaking of the Grand Trunk, he used these words:—

"I never believed they would be base enough to go back on England and come out in favour of the union of Canada with the United States, and using the power of the road to strike down British institutions in this country. If

Mr. MULOCK.

Canada has assisted the Canadian Pacific Railroad it has received a *quid pro quo*. But Canada has lent an enormous sum of money to the Grand Trunk and not a dollar has been repaid. We lent the Canadian Pacific \$30,000,000 and every dollar of that amount was paid before it was due. When Mr. Laurier declared that the United States would be justified in retaliating, and cutting off intercourse with Canada; and Wiman declared that the cutting off of railway communication with Canada would bankrupt our railways; when Farrar writes down to Washington to get them to stop the bonding privileges, you find these craven creatures, the Grand Trunk Railway management, who are represented as being in the power of the United States, you find them joining with the enemies of Canada in playing the game of the United States which seeks to destroy and ruin them."

If that is not a vilification of the Grand Trunk, language fails, I think, to supply what would be vilification. If that is not an accusation that a great party in Canada were seeking to destroy British institutions, I cannot conceive what language would express such an idea. It is as clear as it is false, and it is absolutely clear. He goes on:—

"And you find Sir Henry Tyler lending himself and the great corporation which, unhappily for the shareholders, he dominates, not to the support of the institutions of the country where they have prospered, but throwing their whole weight and influence against us."

Sir, is it not an assault on the Grand Trunk Railway to tell the shareholders that, unfortunately for them, Sir Henry Tyler is their president? When did Sir Charles make the discovery that Sir Henry Tyler was unfit to administer the affairs of that company? For many years he had been its administrator, and during all those years he had, I believe, enjoyed the confidence of Sir Charles Tupper. How is it that that confidence only ceased when Sir Henry Tyler declined to be clay in his hands when his services in an election were needed? He goes on to say further:—

"I will say further that the worst blow Canada ever received in England was that caused by the loss of millions of pounds to English investors because of the jobbery, extravagance and corruption of the Grand Trunk." Could there be a graver or a more explicit charge made? If there was jobbery, extravagance and corruption, there was robbery. There can be no such transactions as these in the management of a public trust without the commission of a high crime by the trustees; and Sir Charles Tupper, in charging the Grand Trunk management with jobbery, extravagance and corruption, has charged those responsible for the company with offences of a most grave and serious character. Surely the hon. Minister of Justice cannot have read this paragraph, before uttering such an unsound defence as he makes. Then, Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:—

"While every man who invested a dollar in the Canadian Pacific Railway is drawing interest on his money, thousands of people who invested in Grand Trunk stocks not only receive no interest, but have sunk their capital."

That failure of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to meet its liabilities is of no recent date. It happened long ago, long before people of my generation were in public life. When Sir Charles was an active politician here, then was the time for him to speak in defence of the unfortunate shareholders, if it happened that they were suffering because of jobbery, extravagance and corruption.—

"It was these investments which so damaged Canada in the eyes of the British public, and even to-day with its wild and reckless purchases of additional railways, purchased for the purpose of obstructing or heading off the

Canadian Pacific Railway, in which additional millions of money are being sunk, is involving the Grand Trunk shareholders in still greater ruin."

Now, these are words fully covering the language of the resolution with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, which language I may remind you again is as follows:—

"Assaulting and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway and in reflecting upon the position of the said company."

As if it were not sufficient to have published that speech in the Canadian press, it was made to appear in the English press as well, in order that it might do its work, whatever that was—in order that it might injure the management of the Grand Trunk Railway and destroy the confidence of the proprietors in that management, the ultimate object probably being to overthrow the management by producing, in the meantime, a depreciation in the securities of that company. And so not satisfied with first of all publishing that speech in Canada *verbatim* in the *Halifax Herald*, the High Commissioner had it republished in the columns of the great thunderer, the *Times* of England; and as if that were not sufficient, coming back to the charge again a little later, after time was had for reflection, and when, if there had been any overstatement there was the opportunity to tone it down, we find that Sir Charles Tupper followed up this accusation by a letter published in the *Times* and the *Canadian Gazette* of the 8th and 9th April, which he concluded as follows:—

"Allow me to repeat that it will give me great pleasure to meet Sir Henry Tyler in the presence of his shareholders, and not only to substantiate the accuracy of all that I have said, but show them how their best interests have been sacrificed by the miserable management of their president.

I think the Minister of Justice failed to see that report as well. We have clearly established that the statements in the resolution are statements of facts. If so, then the Minister of Justice, who seems to have adopted the principle of the resolution, must, if the facts are proved, as I contend they are, support it. The hon. the Minister of Justice did not pretend to defend the conduct of Sir Charles upon any ground whatever. He simply said that the High Commissioner did not do the things he was accused of having done. If these documents are true, if it is the case that the *Halifax Herald* correctly reported Sir Charles Tupper's speech, if it is true that he wrote the letter of the 9th April to the *Times*, the case is proven; and the Minister of Justice will quiet his qualms of conscience, if he has any, and be satisfied the evidence is sufficient to sustain the resolution, and will support it. There are very grave interests of Canada entrusted to the High Commissioner. I, for one, think we are warranted in saying that a public servant, be he in a high position or in a humble position, should discharge the duties he is called upon to discharge. If this office be one the country demands—and I must differ from others in that regard, as I believe there are great Canadian interests which should be attended to, and that the office is one we ought to maintain—the incumbent of that office should be at all times on the spot where his services are required, instead of being free, as the present incumbent is, to come and go as he pleases. I do not say he came to Canada on his own motion, but he is constantly absent from his duties, and at critical periods. Take for ex-

ample what is going on now. About a week ago there came across the wires news that the authorities at Liverpool had stopped a cargo of cattle from landing, on the charge that pleuro-pneumonia had broken out among the herd. Where was the High Commissioner on that occasion? We are just commencing now our cattle shipments for the year, and I see by the press that Sir Charles Tupper has gone to Vienna. It is said that he has gone there to take part in some convention of a public character, having to do with the postal system; but I maintain that the cattle interest alone, which has been referred to by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), is of such great importance to the country that the High Commissioner should not be for one moment out of reach during that shipping period. Let that trade be checked seriously for a moment, and the result will be great injury to the best interests of the people. But the unfounded and unwarrantable act to which I have referred, of stopping the landing of the cattle, depreciated the value of cattle in Canada. And yet, with the experience before us, with the possibility of that happening tomorrow, with the possibility of its happening even while we are engaged in this debate, the one trusted servant to whom we have given charge of our interests, and who, it is said, is so capable of guarding them, is away on the continent a thousand miles from the scene of danger. I say that his duties demand his attendance on the spot; and whilst these exigencies do not exist in the winter months, yet, if he has to be at the beck and call of his party on all occasions, we may have him removed from his legitimate sphere of action at the very moment he ought to be there. But leaving that question aside and coming back to the resolution itself, whilst perhaps Sir Charles Tupper has not in his speeches, as the Minister of Justice has contended, expressly declared that the Liberal party and the electorate supporting it are disloyal, yet he has endeavoured to hold out to the people that there was a very disloyal sentiment in Canada; and he has been pluming himself since the election on the assured fact that he and his allies succeeded in saving Canada to the British flag. His whole attitude bears out the statement in the resolution before us; and whatever may be said with reference to the accusation brought against the Liberal party, there is no controversy as to the facts with regard to the Grand Trunk. So far as the Liberal party is concerned they can withstand such assaults; their record is sufficient to carry them safely through any such attacks. It may serve party purposes to make these accusations; it may serve hon. gentlemen opposite to give colour to the accusation of the High Commissioner, but I contend the Liberal party is true to the interests of Canada. And it is ungenerous and unpatriotic on the part of the High Commissioner or a Minister of the Crown, or any member of the House, to assail any portion of the community and to thus inflict an injury upon the whole country. The fact that the party opposite endeavoured to capture a victory on any such ground explains why they will not to-day admit candidly that a great mistake has been made and promise amendment for the future. Why, the hon. member for Assiniboia admitted that, when he pleaded for mercy to the High Commissioner—

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MULOCK—on the ground that he had committed an error.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman asked us: Are you going to punish a great man like the High Commissioner, who saved the cattle trade, for one error?

Mr. DAVIN. I said, if there was an error.

Mr. MULOCK. Why speak of hypothesis at all. If there was no error, why dream of error. There was no error, according to my hon. friend's judgment, because what the High Commissioner did was not done accidentally. At the same time it was in strictness, as he says, an error, but I am not prepared, because of the services that a public man may have rendered in one capacity, to entirely free him from responsibility for errors he may have committed. Praise and blame come to all men. Men ought to receive due recognition for their services, and if they transgress they should receive censure, and that is the position in which Sir Charles has placed himself. The facts being proved, as the Minister of Justice admits, the resolution should pass, and I trust the House will pass the resolution.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House while I intervene in this debate, not so much to press any individual argument of my own home to the minds of those who have followed the motion, but, in justice to one who is absent, to produce some evidence and some statements directly in point and upon which, if anything, this motion is based, but which, strange to say, and not to their credit, hon. gentlemen who ask the censure of this House upon Sir Charles Tupper have refrained from producing. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House drew its attention to a portion of the argument of the Minister of Justice, and I think his statement of a portion of that argument was as fair as the statements made by other hon. gentlemen during this debate. The hon. gentleman, in stating the position of the Minister of Justice, forgot entirely what the Minister of Justice said. The Minister of Justice pointed out, not merely that no evidence had been produced by the leader of the Opposition in support of the very serious and very grave amendment which he presented to the House, but he stated two or three things—first, that it was significant and extraordinary that a motion of this kind should be presented to the House without any presentation of the evidence upon which it was based; secondly, that the evidence could not be produced; and, thirdly, that this evidence went to show that, if the facts were presented to the House, there would be no reason or cause for censure. Now, the hon. gentleman, in endeavouring to strengthen the position of his leader, has to resort to evidence which was never alluded to by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has been compelled to rush off to the columns of a newspaper and to give extract after extract in support of this motion, stating that that language justified the motion, that that was the proof, and yet the leader of the Opposition, wholly regardless of that evidence, without having it under his hand, asked the House to rush pell-mell, without any evidence, into a condemnation of a political opponent. I say—and I speak under some difficulty and shall be careful, as I hope not

Mr. Mulock.

to allow myself to be carried away too much by personal feeling—that the records of this House, from the first time of its history down to the present, do not show such an indecent haste as has been exhibited here in connection with the motion now under consideration. I say that men who have held not half such important positions as that of the High Commissioner in England to-day, when charged with having committed any impropriety against the Rules of this House, or with having improperly discharged their duties, have had the charges presented to the House in a formal and decent manner. If this case is anything like as serious as hon. gentlemen pretend it is, if it were not connected with political spleen, and party spite, and party malice, you would have seen a very different resolution from this one, a resolution which embodied some spirit of fair-play. If these hon. gentlemen were sure of their case, if they were sure that a case could be made out justifying a vote of censure, they would have asked either for a special committee, where all the evidence could be marshalled and examined, or, at all events, they would have given the officer holding the high position which they say the High Commissioner holds, an opportunity of meeting them face to face, at the Bar of the House. But it will be remembered that, when the High Commissioner was inside the Bar, these charges were not made in the same tones or with the same animus as we have heard them declaimed in this debate. The hon. gentlemen who have forgotten themselves in the language they have used in this debate were then the most polite members in their references to Sir Charles Tupper. I will admit that this does not apply to the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), whose language was always as abusive, as personal, and as—I was about to use a worse expression, but perhaps the Rules of the House would not permit it—when that hon. gentleman was present, as when he is absent, and the language he now uses will, no doubt, be as effective in the House and in the country outside as the arguments which he indulged in before. But, outside of that hon. gentleman, who has never been guilty of civility to anyone in this House, whether in his own party or opposed to him, an hon. gentleman who has never been known to say a kind thing in regard to anybody—and I have sat in Parliament with him for a long time—what are we to think of the other hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), after being one of the most polite men Sir Charles Tupper had a chance of meeting in political life, either in this House or out of it, was in such haste to heap up abuse on that hon. gentleman that he even forgot the Queen's English. He spoke of him as an "unveracious calumniator."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I used the words of his leader.

Mr. TUPPER. I can stand, and the High Commissioner can stand, all the other epithets used by the other hon. gentlemen so that I need not expose them in this House, nor need I dwell on that unfortunate family history of theirs, but I insist, on behalf of the High Commissioner, that good English should be used in this House. Foul words flow across this House very frequently, but a professor of law at a great university, a distinguished philosopher, should not make such an exhibition of ill-

temper as to abuse a man in such bad English as that.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER. When the House rose for recess I was about to do what the hon. gentlemen who are promoting this resolution of censure, have largely abstained from doing, and that was to consider what the charges in that motion were, what those charges involved, what evidence there was to support them, and what the facts of the case really were. Hon. gentlemen have been listening to fierce phillipics against the character of Sir Charles Tupper, they have listened in this House to a repetition of all the stale slanders that are found in the political pit of garbage for the last thirty years, during which time the character of the hon. gentleman which is under discussion, has been so acceptable to the majority of the people of this country as to excite the intense envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness of the leaders of the party which he has damaged so materially, not merely in the last election but in all the elections in which he has been engaged more or less over that very long period in the life of a public man. The proposed motion of censure is, I submit, not supported in fact, cannot be supported in fact. Those who are promoting it have carefully abstained from the most satisfactory course that could be adopted to prove either the truth or the falsity of the charges therein contained. In several particulars the resolution proposed is extravagantly inaccurate, extravagantly false, not to say cowardly in the extreme. It reads:

"The conduct and language of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner of Canada in England, in interfering in the recent elections and in imputing treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion, and also in assailing and vilifying the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and in reflecting upon the position of the said Company, is a breach of the duties of the office—"

And so forth. These statements have not been supported except from the mouths of gentlemen who are smarting from the effects of a defeat at a time when they confidently counted on victory. Those gentlemen have said what they considered the words "Liberal party" to mean. It is true those hon. gentlemen said that Sir Charles Tupper did all these terrible things, but they have each and every one failed, and I believed they feared, to read to this House the extended remarks of any speech or the whole of any article written by that gentleman. But they have attempted to garble speeches, to give an extract here and there, and quickly coupled with that extract their own partisan and heated interpretation. There has been, in my humble judgment, no attempt at fair play. I admit, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am not the best judge of the mode of conducting the debate on this subject. I speak under all these difficulties, I see them face to face: but, notwithstanding that, whatever may be the motives that may be supposed to induce me to speak as I do, I am fully aware that in this House and out of it, no mere word of mine will influence the opinion of any man, woman, or child in the country. But to the record I appeal, and the record of the gentleman attacked is, I submit, strong and unimpeachable.

Now, the hon. gentlemen have, I contend, not been able to show that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large proportion of the people of this Dominion. On the contrary, the position taken by that hon. gentleman in the contest, at an important period in the history of this country, at a crisis in the history of the Dominion of Canada, is the position taken by the majority of the people of this country, is the position taken by the majority of the members of this House, is the position sustained by the overwhelming majority of the province from which that gentleman came, and in which that gentleman is best known, and is a position sustained, I am sure, by a majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite. For, mark you, Mr. Speaker, Sir Charles Tupper was as careful as the leaders with whom he worked in the late campaign, clearly to distinguish the opinions of the electors of this country from the opinions of certain leaders of a certain political party in this country. I took an important part in the campaign in one of the smaller and minor provinces, as some gentlemen are pleased to call them. I was on many a hustings outside of my own county, and continuously in that county, and I never heard in any part of the Province of Nova Scotia, or in the county I have the honour to represent, any friend of mine, or any member of the Liberal-Conservative party, bring the charge alluded to against any appreciable proportion of the people of this country. We were careful not to do so. We believed that the record of the Liberal party was such as to preclude the truth of such a charge being established; we believed that the history of Canada from 1867 to the present day had been such that it was only necessary for a public man to point out the dangers of a course of the kind that was being pursued by politicians and by men anxious to obtain power by any means, in order to secure its condemnation and annihilation. I say, coming from the Province of Nova Scotia, that had it not been that the Liberals professed to be out of sympathy with such a course as the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), for instance, has laid down; if the hon. gentlemen now sitting in this House, some of whom I have heard on the platform, had not taken the earliest opportunity to insist that they would never support the policy defined by the member for South Oxford, that of discriminating against the mother country in favour of a foreign country, instead of there being three, or four, or five members from the Province of Nova Scotia supporting that hon. gentleman, not one man could have been returned from any constituency in that province. Why, so far from it being true that we waged the battle on those lines, so far from it being true that this was a general charge that was hurled against the Opposition, it has been stated over and over again by members on this side of the House, and by their friends in this country, that there was no real annexation sentiment in this country or in any province of it, but that the people were being tricked and played with. That was the charge made openly, on the hustings, before the people. And the great difficulty was to open the eyes of all the electors to the serious conspiracy that was going on, aided and abetted as it was by men in a foreign country, supported as it was by men high in position in the political arena in this country;

but the confidence of the Liberal-Conservative party was that so soon as the electors realized the designs of those designing leaders, of those reckless leaders, of those leaders who seemed for the moment to stoop to anything to deceive the people, their opinions would be declared. I have heard the expression "ruined gamblers" used. There were gamblers in the fight, and the people understood who the gamblers were. The Liberal-Conservative party and its leaders felt their only duty was to expose the game, not on the part of the Liberal Opposition of the country, not on the part of a great proportion of that party, but on the part of their leaders, and the outside allies of those leaders in a foreign country. Sir Charles Tupper, with all the faults that have been laid at his door, has been admittedly to some extent a successful and not entirely a stupid politician. So far as his experience has gone, or the experience of the country has decided, is it to be supposed that he branded the whole Liberal party, and thereby a large portion of the people, as traitors and as disloyal? To take the lowest ground of political expediency, can it be believed that Sir Charles Tupper was guilty of the first charge contained in the resolution, and, second, that it was necessary or politic to take such a position in this country. I can show by the record, by the written words, by the reported utterances of the man whose character is maligned, of the man who is attacked by men who desire to wound him, as far as they can notwithstanding all their ineffectual attempts in the past, the statements in the resolution to be false and shamefully false. For instance, take the statement of the issues involved in the late campaign. When reviewing them in an article already alluded to, what was the language of the gentleman concerned? Some references have been made to these articles and to his speeches, but they were fragmentary and incomplete, and consisted of extracts prepared to suit a purpose. In an article in the *North American Review* for May, 1891, published by Sir Charles Tupper, this is the statement made, and I ask the attention of those hon. members who desire, before recording their votes, to consider the material facts involved:

"Mr. Wiman boasts that he is a British subject; yet after he had propounded his scheme for commercial union in an address to the Boot and Shoe Club at Boston, in January last, when exception was taken to it by Mr. Murray on the ground that it did not insure the annexation of Canada to the United States, the *Boston Herald* of January 22 reports:

"Mr. Wiman briefly replied to the arguments used by Mr. Murray. The speaker urged that, if it was desired to lessen the power of England, that end could not be accomplished better than by Canada trading with the United States and ceasing to trade with Great Britain.' . . . 'The very thing Mr. Murray wants to accomplish,' said Mr. Wiman, 'will be better accomplished by the plan I propose than by the plan he proposes.'"

I may say for the information of those hon. gentlemen who have not studied this question, or looked into it, that Mr. Murray's plan was the kind plan of starving us out, of refusing unrestricted reciprocity or reciprocity of any kind, so that the design would be accomplished, according to this patriotic citizen of the United States, of bringing our country finally and fully within the confines of the American union; and Mr. Wiman urged that his proposal of commercial union would more speedily bring about that desired end than that system of force and compulsion. Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

Mr. TUPPER.

"If that is not sufficient, read Mr. Wiman's sworn evidence, page 752 of testimony taken by the Senate commission:

"Suppose your commission should report in favour of unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States; then suppose at the next general election, which takes place within the next eighteen months, the Liberal party, adopting that as the sole plank in their platform, should be returned by a large majority, and Parliament should take on a commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity complexion—"

I stop merely to remind those hon. gentlemen who are following me that that was the scheme to bring about, in the opinion of Mr. Wiman, political union, and not merely the opinion of Mr. Wiman, but in the opinion of Mr. Blake also,—

—"they would be in control of the Government; they would meet your invitation by a vote; that would have to go to England to be consented to by the royal authorities."

Any schoolboy, let alone a member of this House, is aware that this allusion to 1776, and the Boston tea-party, means resistance to the wishes and desires of the mother country. Sir Charles Tupper continues:

"Suppose the English Government refused; then the Canadians would be relieved from their fealty, which would be as much a justification for a Boston tea-party as there was in 1776 or prior.

"So that nothing could contribute so much to bring about annexation, if it is thought in the end to be desirable, as to have closer commercial relations."

He concludes this article by saying:

"But the ugly fact remained that Mr. Wiman, convicted by the letters of Mr. Farrer—"

I may mention that Mr. Farrer occupied a very high and responsible position on a paper supposed to be controlled and largely owned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—the *Toronto Globe*. Mr. Farrer was the brains of that paper, and was the acknowledged editor, and the significance of this statement is proved more strongly by the fact that when the designs of that man were exposed to the electors of the country a flank movement had to be executed, and a man, his junior on the paper, a man not possessing the ability to fill it as compared with Mr. Farrer, was placed in the position, and Mr. Farrer ceased to occupy the position of the editor of the *Toronto Globe*. Whether that statement is correct or not, this statement is notorious. Mr. Farrer is still the ablest writer in the columns of the *Globe*, the organ of the Opposition party, then or now largely under the control and inspiration of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).—

—"and Mr. Hitt being engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to subvert British institutions in Canada, still implored for 'moral support' from Congress and the people of the United States for the Laurier-Cartwright party, and the Government were sustained by a larger majority than they had at the previous general elections. To complete the discomfiture of the Opposition, this was followed by the publication of a letter from the Hon. Ed. Blake, one of the most able and respected members of the party who, rather than bind himself to their policy, had ceased to be their leader—"

I take it that no one will deny the accuracy of that statement. I take it that that statement has been proved, and the only answer is the outraged feeling expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford that we obtained the evidence of treason and conspiracy in an underhand manner. Sir Charles Tupper continues:

—"and who now declares that his refusal to go into the battle with them was because he was unable to fight under false colours."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TUPPER. Some hon. members say "Oh, oh." No doubt their feelings are aggravated by the verification of that statement. I ask the House to mark these words, written in May, 1891, and which are germane to the words in the resolution of censure :—

"Mr. Blake, who I may say, represents the great body of the Opposition, who, with few exceptions, are loyal to British institutions, has rudely torn the mask which Farrer fixed, from the faces of the conspirators and the delusion of unrestricted reciprocity may be regarded as dead and buried."

Some hon. gentlemen may claim that unrestricted reciprocity is a pretty lively corpse, but that it is a corpse I do not think anyone denies, and that it has been decently buried can hardly be gainsaid with safety. I had the opportunity of taking part in an election after the general elections and it seemed to me that the hon. member who now sits for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) accepted the situation like a man, and got in very quickly behind the form of the late leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) and not behind the present leader of the Opposition. But Sir Charles Tupper is on record further in reference to what he did say, and mark you, Mr. Speaker, all that I have read and all that I propose to read from the pen or from the lips of Sir Charles Tupper is in perfect accord and on the lines of the statements made by the recognized leaders of the Liberal-Conservative party in this country, and which were endorsed and ratified by the people at the polls. The remark applies to all, with the solitary exception as to the statements made and the proofs admitted in the press, concerning the action taken by that corporation known as the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. That portion alone of the censure is to some extent, so far as we have evidence before us, separated from the policy upon which the people have already pronounced, and upon which they pronounced in so unmistakable a manner. In the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1891, Sir Charles Tupper further explains, for the benefit, no doubt, of hon. gentlemen who with malice for him and general ill-will towards the party on this side of the House, have stated his views to be exactly contrary to what he himself has expressed them to be. He says :

"About four years ago an Americanized Canadian who has resided in New York for the last quarter of a century, found them, like Japhet, in search of a policy—"

It is to be noticed, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition did not complain of that language, and I take it that they not having denied it, and not having cavilled about it, and not having made any great fuss over it, that they do admit they were in search of a policy, that they were on their last legs so to speak, and that Mr. Wiman or any other gentleman who was in control of considerable funds in the neighbouring country, might very well be the leader for those who had found such great difficulty in organizing within their own country and on their own resources.—

"About four years ago an Americanized Canadian who has resided in New York for the last quarter of a century, found them, like Japhet, in search of a policy, and an easy prey to his scheme of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Laurier joined hands with Mr. Wiman, and the Hon. Mr. Hitt, a member of the House of Representatives in the United States, in agitating this policy in the press, on the platform, in the House of Representatives in the United States, and in the Canadian House of Commons. Sir Richard Cartwright obtained

the services of Mr. Ed. Farrer to edit the *Globe* newspaper, his principal organ. Mr. Wiman, in the United States, pointed out the means of 'capturing Canada,' and utilizing her 5,000,000 of consumers to promote the interests of American manufacturers, while Sir Richard Cartwright agitated Canada, both in and out of Parliament, with the pernicious doctrine of utter dependence upon the United States."

I recollect, in this connection, that until the last election, when the eyes of the people of this country were really opened as to what the conspiracy meant, that these two gentlemen—at Ingersoll, I think, one of them, and at Oakville, I think, two of them—used to refer to these gentlemen across the border as "our allies in the United States ;" but in the last campaign not one of them was man enough to continue that appellation. Mr. Wiman, who wrote very mischievous articles—articles that, I freely admit, assisted us materially in the campaign, by exposing the designs and giving proof of the conspiracy that was alleged by the people and by a large number of their representatives—Mr. Wiman was utterly ignored by them. Indeed, on some platforms he was actually denounced, but, nevertheless, the people understood that at picnics where Mr. Wiman was present with a good and leal Liberal of this House, or an Attorney-General in a good Reform Cabinet in one of the provinces, or no matter where he was, his utterances were reported in the columns of the *Toronto Globe* ; his pamphlets were distributed over this country, and all the good was taken that could be taken out of the mouth of an admitted traitor, out of the mouth of a man who was a self-confessed traitor and conspirator at public meetings in Massachusetts and before committees of Congress. This man is the man with whom it is stated Sir Richard Cartwright and the Hon. Mr. Laurier joined hands ; and they also joined hands with the Hon. Mr. Hitt, a member of the House of Representatives in the United States, in agitating this policy in the press, on the platform, in the House of Representatives in the United States, and in the Canadian House of Commons. He proceeds :

"The Honourable Mr. Hitt had reported a resolution from the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives proposing commercial union with Canada. He described it in these terms :

"What is commercial union with Canada ? It means, as set out in this resolution, the adoption by both countries of precisely the same tariff of duties or taxes to be levied on goods coming from abroad, abolishing altogether our line of custom houses on the north, by which we collect tariff duties on goods coming from Canada ; abolishing their custom houses along the same line, by which they collect duties upon goods we send into Canada ; and leaving intercourse as unrestricted between this country and Canada as it is between the States. The line of custom houses would follow the sea and include both countries."

"The internal revenue system of taxes on liquors and tobacco in the two countries would also have to be made uniform in both."

"The proceeds of taxation thus collected would be equitably divided, and the fairest way would seem to be in proportion to population."

I may call the attention of the hon. gentlemen of this House to the fact that Mr. Hitt is the man who only a short time before the general election was fondly numbered among "the allies of the great Liberal party of this country." It goes on to say :

"Mr. Hitt had invariably resisted any action in Congress for freer trade relations with Canada. The 'Congressional Record' reports him as saying on the 8th of June, 1888 : 'I am in favour of unrestricted trade with Canada, and still more of commercial union, and with the hope of such a solution of all our troubles in the north.'"

Their chief troubles in the north are that they could not obtain any share of the fisheries which belong to us as a right, but which they desire to have, and which any State in the Union would be just as zealous of guarding from any other State as we are zealous of guarding them from the United States, or any other country in the world. It continues:

"I have thought we should not at this time touch the tariff of lumber and the other products of Canada while they are a motive for an active movement toward us from this side of Canada. At the great meeting in Toronto on the 17th of February, Sir John Macdonald charged Mr. Farrer, the leading editor of the *Globe* newspaper, the organ of the Opposition, with having secretly printed twelve copies of a pamphlet containing these atrocious suggestions for the destruction of Canada, and forcing it into annexation with the United States."

This is the language of one of the men now I believe, and certainly then, in the pay and in the service of hon. gentlemen opposite or their leaders, or of those acting with them and for whom their leaders are responsible:

"The imposition by the United States of a tonnage tax on all Nova Scotian vessels, laden whole or in part with fish, would speedily put an end to seizures, and, indeed, the whole controversy. Another ready way of bringing the Government and all concerned to their senses would be to suspend the bonding privilege, or to cut the connection of the Canadian Pacific with United States territory at Sault Ste. Marie. Either of these methods would rouse the full force of Eastern Canada influence against the Government."

"It would be better still to oblige Britain to withdraw her countenance and support from the Canadian contention as she did in 1871. That would secure the end desired, without leaving the United States open to the charge of being animated by hatred of Canada, on which Sir John Macdonald trades. Whatever course the United States may see fit to adopt, it is plain that Sir John's disappearance from the stage is to be the signal for a movement towards annexation. The enormous debt of the Dominion (\$50 per head), the virtual bankruptcy of all the provinces, except Ontario,—"

One would imagine the hon. gentleman from South Oxford had written this, and not his editor—

"the pressure of the American tariff upon trade and industry, the incurable issue of race, and the action of the natural forces making for the consolidation of the lesser country with the greater have already prepared the minds of most intelligent Canadians for the destiny that awaits them, and a leader will be forthcoming when the hour arrives."

"Mr. Farrer admitted the publication, but attempted to excuse himself by saying:

"Not a single one was circulated in Washington or elsewhere. I can vouch for that. They were not intended for the eye of any person in Congress, nor had I the remotest intention of prejudicing the case of Canada in respect of the North Atlantic fisheries. I wrote freely and privately concerning what I regard as the illogical, unfair, and wholly out-of-date policy which the Government of the Dominion has pursued towards the vessels of a friendly neighbour, and, having been asked, proffered my view of the mode which I should favour, were I an American, of bringing about a more rational state of affairs for both countries."

"The *Globe* supported this denial by the following statement in its issue of February 21—"

And I call the attention of this House to this important part of the statement made by a man, whether he is the High Commissioner, or whether he is a Conservative politician who has achieved a great success to the chagrin of his opponents, now savage and wild from their continued defeats, as a statement not only worthy of the notice of the two contending parties in this country, but worthy of careful consideration, which I believe it got in the main, at the hands of all people interested in the welfare and the autonomy of the Dominion of Canada.—

Mr. TUPPER.

"The *Empire* alleged yesterday that the pamphlet written by Mr. Farrer was written for the information of Mr. Hitt, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission at Washington. Mr. Hitt telegraphed yesterday as follows:— 'I never saw or heard of the pamphlet described by Sir John Macdonald. Nor have I ever heard of Canadians coming here for political consultations, although I have seen many distinguished Canadians, both Conservatives and Liberals, whom I have met socially, but nothing more.—R. R. HITT.'"

"Finding," says Sir Charles Tupper, in answer to this:

—"that we were face to face with a formidable conspiracy to subvert British institutions in Canada, and annex it to the United States, I felt it my duty to lay before the public, at a meeting at Windsor, 23rd February, the following evidence in my possession which conclusively proves that Messrs. Farrer, Wiman and Hitt were united in that conspiracy:—

"TORONTO, 22nd April, 1889.

"MY DEAR MR. WIMAN.—Our Ottawa man will send a good summary of your speech, so that on our account you need not go to the trouble of preparation. At present the commercial union movement is at a standstill. First of all the Jesuit agitation, which is here to stay, has to some extent supplanted it."

That was what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) thought when he made certain references to the leader of the Opposition with which I did not sympathize.

Mr. CHARLTON. You ought not to have stolen the letter.

Mr. TUPPER. Ah, there is the cry. The only defence to the exposure of this conspiracy is: "You ought not to have stolen the letter." But I think the main thing is to lay the traitor by the heels.—

"Secondly, the general belief is that the Republicans would not listen to any such scheme. Thirdly, a very large number of persons are inclined to think that we had better make for annexation at once instead of making two bites on the cherry. Lastly, the old parties here are rapidly breaking up, and when Sir John goes we shall be adrift without a port in sight, save annexation. Moreover, although the Liberals have taken up commercial union they are not pushing it with any vigour."

No; scandal is the stock in trade of some parties.—

"For these reasons the *Mail* has, in the slang of the day, given the subject a rest. There is really no use talking it up to a people whose politics are in a state of flux, and whose future is wrapped in doubt. I saw Mr. Hoar while at Washington, and told him just what he says I did, namely: That the smaller forces favour annexation, and will favour it all the more if commercial union be withheld. It seems to me, and I have talked the matter over lately with maritime members as well as with Manitobans, that commercial union would only delay the coming of the event those people most desire. Hence, in the provinces referred to commercial union does not take hold, whereas annexation will always demand a hearing. In Ontario the Jesuit campaign has brought that aspect of things home to thousands who would not look at commercial union. The littleness—"

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to Mr. Edward Farrer now.—

"The littleness and half-heartedness of the Liberals is also very disheartening."

I ask especial attention to this.—

"Then, again, the truth is that every man who preaches commercial union would prefer annexation, so that the party is virtually wearing a mask."

Why is not Mr. Farrer censured, I ask? Why is he not brought to the Bar of this House for slandering these hon. gentlemen? I believe he told the truth about hon. gentlemen opposite; I believe he knew of what he was talking about when he spoke of the "littleness and half-heartedness" of these hon. gentlemen who he said were wearing a mask; but I do not include in that the rank and file of the Liberal party, as I said before. The design—

ing leaders—those are the men that Mr. Farrer and I have in view just now. Then he says :

“ ‘ Can’t you come round this way and have a talk.

“ ‘ Yours very truly,

(Signed) “ ‘ E. FARRER.’ ”

I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten these letters. They were all astray, Mr. Speaker, when they singled out Sir Charles Tupper; they had forgotten all the documentary evidence. Certainly it is charitable to say so, because they produced none. Then, this is from Washington :

“ ‘ HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

“ ‘ WASHINGTON, D.C., April 25, 1889.

“ ‘ ERASTES WIMAN, Esq.,

314 Broadway, New York,

“ ‘ DEAR SIR.—I am greatly obliged to you for sending to me the proof slips of the *North American* article, and have been much interested also in Mr. Farrer’s letter, which surprised me somewhat, as I did not think from his conversation, which gave me a very favourable impression, that he would be so easily discouraged. The reasons he gives existed before the commercial union movement began, with greater force than to-day. The Republicans, as protectionists, it was apprehended would be against it. They are not. Their representatives voted for it, their newspapers have received it kindly, and often with warm approval. The Jesuit agitation, which has taken the place of commercial union, in his mind, is largely sentimental, and will probably not last long. The other commercial union is a business question that concerns each citizen, and in a way which he does not understand at first, but sees more and more clearly the more he talks intelligently about it.”

No doubt of that.—

“ ‘ There is some logic in what F. says of not making two bites of a cherry, but going for annexation at once, but I think he is misled on that point in a way that often occurs. Where a man is thinking much upon a point and discussing it, he is liable to narrow his horizon to those within his reach; and his own mind, and, perhaps, those he meets, having passed on by discussion to distant results, he takes it for granted that the wide world, which is so wonderfully slow, has kept up with him, and has the same results in sight. We must be very patient with the slow moving popular mind. If the Canadian public of farmers, artisans, lumbermen, miners, and fishers, can be in three years argued up to the point of voting commercial union, and giving sanction to the movement in Parliament, it will be great progress. Slow as such movements are, the comforting thing is that they never go backward. To you personally it ought to be, in your moments of reflection, a consolation that long hereafter, when this ball which you set rolling has gone on and on, and finished its work, every one may then look back and see and appreciate the service done to mankind by the hand that set it in motion. I shall look with interest for what you say in Ottawa. The *North American Review* article will have a powerful tendency to keep our public men from scattering away on annexation next winter, and I hope we can get the offer of commercial union formulated into law. I return the proof slips of the article, and the letter of Mr. Farrer.

“ ‘ Very truly yours,

(Signed) “ ‘ R. R. HITT.

“ ‘ P.S.—Just received yours of yesterday, with Goldwin Smith’s; it reads admirably.”

And said the man now under indictment :

“ ‘ These letters had been sent to me by a gentleman who received them from Mr. Wiman himself, and who did not disapprove of the use I made of them at so important a crisis. No man can read them and arrive at any other conclusion than that the object and design of Messrs. Wiman, Hitt and Farrer was the annexation of Canada to the United States. They only differed upon the best way in which to accomplish that object. Mr. Farrer was for taking off the mask and acting boldly; Messrs. Wiman and Hitt thought that would endanger success, and that a surer way of obtaining the same result would be to induce the Parliament of Canada to declare for free trade with the United States, with discrimination against England, which must inevitably lead to a quarrel between England and Canada and the severance of the tie that binds us to the Crown.”

And to conclude, Sir Charles Tupper quoted the language of another gentleman, who held a dis-

tinguished position in this House, and who occupies now, and so long as he lives will continue to occupy, a distinguished position in this country. I refer to Mr. Blake; and if hon. gentlemen opposite had been fighting for a principle, if they had not been seeking merely to give vent to personal abuse and personal explanations, they would have coupled the name of the Hon. Edward Blake with that of Sir Charles Tupper in a considerable portion of the resolution of censure now under consideration. Mr. Blake, as Sir Charles Tupper said in the article from which I quote, used these words :

“ ‘ The tendency in Canada of unrestricted free trade with the States, high duties being maintained against the United Kingdom, would be towards political union, and the more successful the plan, the stronger the tendency, both by reason of the community of interests, the intermingling of populations, the more intimate business and social connections, and the trade and fiscal relations, amounting to dependency, which it would create with the States and of the greater isolation and divergence from Britain which it would produce, and also, especially through inconvenience experienced in the maintenance and apprehensions entertained as to the termination of the treaty, our hopes and our fears alike would draw one way. We would then indeed be looking to Washington.”

And yet because he spoke in support of that statement of the Hon. Edward Blake, they ask that Sir Charles Tupper be censured, for having imputed treasonable and disloyal motives to a large portion of the people of this Dominion. According to these hon. gentlemen, he and Mr. Blake imputed those motives to a large proportion of the people of this country. Sir, they imputed them, I impute them, to the men who advocated the scheme of unrestricted reciprocity, reciprocity in conspiracy or in conjunction with the men in the United States, whose utterances I have just read. Why, Sir, not Sir Charles Tupper alone did that. The members of this Government, whom hon. gentlemen opposite have been so anxious to separate from the High Commissioner, have done that. Why is it that throughout this debate, after the leader of the Government stated that it was at his desire the High Commissioner came to this country and spoke the utterances for which he is now called to account, there is so transparent an effort on the part of these hon. gentlemen to remove all blame from the members of the Treasury benches? How is it that they are endeavouring to stir up the feeling that there is a desire on the part of the Government to put all the blame on Sir Charles Tupper? Their opinion certainly, under the circumstances, should be infinitely worse of the late colleagues of Sir Charles Tupper than of that gentleman himself; and the gentlemen who have spoken in this debate have not attempted to conceal what their feelings are personally towards their old opponent. I can assure those hon. gentlemen—those gentlemen honourable by the position they hold, but who have stooped to the language we have heard for the past two days in this House, those gentlemen who have taken pains to rake up the old *Hansards* to find where men have fouled their lips by using language for which they cannot be called to account—I can assure them that, as the language they quoted fell lightly on the head of the man against whom it was uttered, and as the people have treated those statements and charges and the men who made them and now repeat them, so they fall lightly on my head and so they will again be received by the people. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) endeavoured to grow excited the other evening, and it is seldom we see him excited ;

it is seldom a man of his curious temperament, who is always so judicial, surprises us all as he did, by stating that he was highly indignant at any improper or treasonable motives being imputed to him : and in an outburst of anger and resentment, he endeavoured to reach a grand period in his denial of all those charges. The man he said, who would make these charges against him face to face, he would brand as a coward. It seems to me the man who would do so might be branded by many names according to the facts : but surely the hon. gentleman should prefer that the charges be made to his face, and in that event his charge of cowardice, it seems to me, would fall rather flat. But before Mr. Farrer took possession of the *Globe*—or the hon. member for South Oxford, I do not know which—at any rate, before Mr. Farrer—or Mr. Farrer and the member for South Oxford—was in charge of the *Toronto Globe*, there were men in control of that paper who would rather cut off their right hand than be guilty of the utterances of the hon. member for South Oxford or Mr. Farrer, to which I have referred, and which were before the people of this country. In 1880, I suppose it was the late Hon. George Brown who was in charge of the editorial columns of that paper. At any rate, I could give to the House language far stronger than that used by Sir Charles Tupper, characterizing the aspirations of the leaders of the Reform party and the significance of the policy that they put before the people, and which they endeavoured to strengthen by co-operating with Messrs. Hitt and Wiman in the United States. In 1880, this was the language used by the *Toronto Globe* :

"What is the main promise of those who wish to detach the Dominion from Great Britain in order to make the country a preserve for Yankee manufacturers, who are totally unable to compete with British manufacturers on fair terms."

And we know that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated in Ingersoll, and at Orillia in February last, and elsewhere, that his scheme of unrestricted reciprocity meant a discrimination against the goods of the mother country in favour of those of the United States. Indeed, in no other way, he said, could it be obtained. The *Globe* went on to say—was the *Globe* then charging disloyalty or not ?

"One little corner of the 'market of 50,000,000 people' is offered to Canadians as the price of their national extinction ! Men who advocate a base surrender of their country for money do not cease to be disgusting though they become also ridiculous when it is evident they are duped by their own sordid imagination."

There is a phrase in that under which hon. gentlemen who have so much addressed themselves to this subject to-night, might take a certain amount of comfort. The *Globe* speaks of them as dupes, not as out-and-out unmitigated traitors : and perhaps the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) may take advantage of that, and may say that he does not mean what Messrs. Wiman and Hitt consider to be the result of his policy, but that he has all along been a dupe, to use the language of the *Toronto Globe* in 1880. The principal feature of the question under discussion has been only passingly alluded to, and that is the conduct of a public officer. When we started out, and these gentlemen's hands were not fully exposed in this debate, it seemed that it was not so much Sir Charles Tupper, that it was not so much an old

Mr. TUPPER.

opponent whose character was being assailed, but that it was a great principle that was involved, a principle of tremendous importance in the Government of this country that was at stake—that was how far a public officer could engage in a political contest with justice to the Government and to himself. The hon. gentlemen impugned the conduct of the Government, who invited and controlled the action of Sir Charles Tupper in this country, as a violation of our constitution. Some people who have not followed the action of these hon. gentlemen might be led astray by this course of debate, they might think that of all men the leaders of the Opposition were the men to denounce that course of action and to oppose any interference with the election. I have already called the late leader of the Opposition to the rescue of Sir Charles Tupper. I now call the present leader of the Opposition to the rescue of the man he has now denounced and seeks to censure. If there was any principle in the good old days of reform, as it was first preached in Canada, it was the principle that members of Local Governments should preserve the autonomy of the provinces and should sacredly observe the distinction between federal and local politics, so that it would be discreditable for any members of Local Governments to interfere in federal politics, and the hon. gentleman, who was then a follower of the hon. gentleman to whose utterances I am now alluding, no doubt subscribed to those doctrines. In 1871, Mr. Blake used these words, speaking for the Province of Ontario :

"My friends and myself thought and my Administration now thinks * * * that there should exist no other attitude on the part of the Provincial Government toward the Government of the Dominion than one of neutrality. * * * We believe that the Government of this province ought not to assume a position of either alliance or hostility towards the Government of the Dominion."

That would be consistent with the line of argument adopted on a very important part of the question now under consideration, but we have changed all that. A new leader has come to that party, and, with that new leader, there has come a new doctrine, and I ask the attention of the House to the new doctrine as laid down by the leader of the Opposition, who seeks to censure a gentleman for having to some extent adopted that principle, although, as I can show, his position is much stronger, as it is very different, from the position of a Local Government in a federal contest. Hon. gentlemen will admit that, in the last contest, while they were very confident of victory, it was a tremendous struggle, and they will also agree with me that a very large number of the people of Canada believed that we were passing through the most important crisis we have had to face since the year 1867. While some believed we were only a stage removed from civil war and civil strife, I can say, as a young student of political history, that political precedents should weigh very little in such a case with the men who have to bring the ship of state safely through the political storm. Members of the Conservative party went to the country and said they thought it was necessary to elect the Government again, no matter what side issues might be raised, because the national welfare was at stake. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite denied this, as they always deny any such statements, but it was a great crisis, and every effort was put forward by both parties to achieve success. For a moment I

will give the hon. the leader of the Opposition credit for believing that his policy was to redound to the benefit of his party, and that, therefore, he was justified in resorting to a course which was not quite in the same line as that laid down by his late leader :

"Mr. Mercier, he said, would take off his coat and go to work and would be ardently supported by the members of his Cabinet. Mr. Laurier expressed the hope that the members of the Liberal Government of Ontario would do in this province what Mr. Mercier and his friends were doing in Quebec."

But I need not appeal to the utterances of the leader of the Opposition. In my own province it is notorious that the business of the Local Government was almost entirely suspended during the late federal campaign, that men who wanted to go into the mines office on important business had to be turned away with the statement that the Commissioner was in Lunenburg opposing my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach), who, I am happy to say, was not only able to overcome the regular opposition, but also the influence of the Local Government. The leader of the Government in that province went from one end of the province to the other, neglecting his duties, to use the language of the hon. gentleman with reference to the High Commissioner, and, while he did us great benefit, we are not so small as to ask that he should be indicted. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite say, that Sir Charles Tupper's efforts in Ontario were very ineffectual, but they have spent a great deal of time in considering how to counteract what he did in that province. Well, every member, the Attorney General, the Government of that province, all of them have taken this course, and while it could be said: What have we to do with the conduct of a Local Government? and while that answer might be urged against the argument I am now addressing to the House, I submit that there is much in it to show what the impulse is behind hon. gentlemen opposite, whether it is to uphold the constitution, whether it is to proclaim a regular and proper conduct on the part of public officers, or whether it is not to aim a blow, one out of many, to see whether it will not be more effectual in damaging the gentleman now under censure than the blows they have delivered so aimlessly before. The hon. member for South Oxford once alluded to this subject, and he said that when a public officer went into a political contest, he took his office in his hands. He went no further. That has been the principle all along, that is the principle laid down in the books, that when a public officer does that, he takes his political life in his hands. The English Parliament, this Parliament, and the Local Legislatures, have gone further on that general principle, and have legislated specifically so as to prevent certain officials leaving their offices and taking part in an electoral campaign. But the hon. member for South Oxford never, until it occurred to him in this case, took further ground, and said that the Government were bound to dismiss that officer. A distinction is now drawn; there are officers and officers; there is a great difference between the duties and functions of officers. Now, the House will bear with me while I attempt, with great diffidence, the defence of Sir Charles Tupper in a case of this kind. I would rather deal with a subject upon which I can freely speak. I claim, and I submit to the judgment

of this House, that what he did and what he said, was in an entire accord with his leader, with his colleagues, with the men with whom he fought in that great national crisis. But I come to this other point, and I appeal to the hon. gentlemen, in considering the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper, to say whether there were not other peculiar circumstances connected with him and with his position. He was a public officer, forsooth; he was a civil servant, supposed to be removed from all the feelings that pervade this Chamber and actuate men in political life. He was to be an impartial servant to this Government, and he was to keep aloof from all party politics. Did the hon. gentleman believe that? Did that statement come from their hearts, or was there not a smile on the face of many of them? Why, since 1884, when Sir Charles Tupper went to England, down to the present day, there has never been a session of this Parliament at which the time of this House has not been taken up by alluding to the utterances, the opinions of that gentleman upon questions of the day, and by asking this House to animalvert upon his conduct as a politician, not as an officer. They have singled out the items of the expenditure for the office of High Commissioner. They have supposed that the minds of men in this country were so small that they would resent these expenditures, which are large in ordinary life, I grant you, which are not large in the life that gentleman leads at the desire of the Government and people of this country, and they did this in order to prejudice the people, and in order to prejudice this House against him as a statesman. They have gone further, and they have endeavoured to influence—for there must have been some purpose of that kind—the electorate and the members of this House, by insisting that on the great question of the day, on the question of trade, and on the question of our relations with the United States, Sir Charles Tupper—not the High Commissioner, but Sir Charles Tupper—was diametrically opposed to his colleagues and to the Government of this country. I say that you cannot get an audience of free men together in the Dominion of Canada, and lay before them the attacks that have been levelled against that gentleman, the political allusions to him on these great questions of the day, and get them to say that it was not fair, that it was not decent, that it was not proper for him to come as he did, when that question was in the hands of the people, and explain to them, not merely that he was in sympathy with his old colleagues, but that the statements made against him by his old opponents were false, utterly false, hollow, miserable, and incapable of proof, going as he did before his old opponents upon the hustings in every part of Canada and challenging the popular verdict. You say he took his office in his hands, you ascribe all sorts of monetary considerations to him, all sorts of mean propensities. But he did this whether for good or bad reasons; he took a step that certainly would have cost him his office under any circumstances, and he submitted, not merely his own case, he not merely answered the personal attacks that had been made upon him, but he submitted his own views as to the important crisis through which we were passing, and he has the satisfaction, after reading all that hon. gentlemen may say against him to-night, of knowing that the people of this country agreed with him, endorsed him, showed their confidence in him, and that position is, I think, a little

pleasanter than the position of those gentlemen who have gone back to these old charges and have called him "bulldozer," "unveracious calumniator," "Canadian millionaire," "falsifier of facts," with "a black record of jobbery and plunder." Why, Mr. Speaker, whom have they not so attacked who has ever risen to any position of importance in the politics of this country? I ask what leading Conservative statesman of long standing in the Dominion arena, has ever been free from these calumnious charges, these miserable slanders. I regret to say, from the evidence we have now in this House, that no man can rise to a prominent position in political life in Canada without being the target of that kind of abuse, not merely in this Chamber, but from every little rag from the *Globe* down to the smallest two-penny-half-penny organ in the country. It is sad, but it is so. We must pass through that crisis as well, and, I hope, as happily as we have passed through the one to which I alluded. Now, if time permitted I would like to travel into another field. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of some evidence of the verdict of the people of this country; that it was not safe, considering the views expressed and the means taken to obtain a victory at the polls, to entrust hon. gentlemen opposite with the reins of power. I have already carefully stated that through the different ridings in my province, the charge of treason was not levelled at the Liberal party. I have read the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, where he guards himself carefully in this respect. But of treason to Canada, as well as to Great Britain, we had ample evidence. Since that question has been raised let me draw attention to some of the treason with which the Liberal-Conservative party has had to grapple, and in which, in most cases I think, and in all cases, it has been able to trample out in this country. For instance, I have alluded to the allies of the Liberal party in the United States. We have given—and I merely refer to the fact—tolerably good evidence of the object of certain people living in the United States in connection with their co-operation with the Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada. But has the House forgotten that allies of the Liberal leaders in this country declared their dire hatred of Canada and of their union with this country? I ask the hon. gentleman to recollect the language of their allies in the province from which I come, of the language used by men who acknowledge reform principles, so called, in Canada, who worked with them, who hoped for their success, and who have co-operated with them from the start down to the present day. I refer to the secessionists in Canada, to those men who preferred annexation and stated in the halls of the legislature they preferred annexation to the United States to union with Canada, and asserted that this was a revolt against Canada and nothing else. Those gentlemen find pleasant company on the benches opposite, and the Attorney General of that province in former days, and at the present time, has not hesitated to say that the great question of the party there was Nova Scotia against Canada, and that was the issue. But I call on the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to furnish evidence of the traitorous effect of the doctrine he preaches. He asked for the proof, I have given the proof before my peers, the people have passed on it. This

Mr. TUPPER.

is the language in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared what the doctrine he now advocates really means:

"Consider what is involved in saying that this country is dependent on the fiscal policy of a foreign power. These men who tell you that it is impossible to exist as a commercial people unless you have reciprocity, might as well tell the United States that if they want to drive you into the union, all they have to do is to refuse you reciprocity for a certain number of years longer, which is the very best way that could be adopted of inducing the American people to refuse to enter into commercial relations with us. For my part I will deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or another, and no Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among a great number of his fellow countrymen."

That is his own construction of the language he has used on hustling after hustings and it is language now recorded on the journals of this House. But I could go further, and give further proof. It is true I am merely telling what hon. gentlemen have read before, but we must, in order to be decent in the consideration of this question, place these matters on record and have the whole question fairly considered. This is the language used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Boston, Massachusetts, when the hon. gentleman received his new title; and since the day he was appointed Senator of the United States for the Province of Ontario, no one, I believe, has ever seen the Order of St. Michael and St. George, or any sign that he belongs to the British aristocracy, against which the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) sneered so vigorously. The hon. member for South Oxford said:

"Briefly, Sir, if this project can be carried out it will mean for you the addition of half a continent for commercial purposes and the creating of a complete new tier of Northern states, with an enormous area of unoccupied fertile land, with very great mineral resources, with a present population of some 5,000,000 but with the capacity of maintaining fully 50,000,000, and the certainty in such a contingency of a very rapid increase: which population, and I hold this no small matter, is essentially in character as your own, with much the same habits, customs and prejudices even."

And again he said:

"The advantages of your position for securing a very large part of our trade are great. You own, as I have said much of our mineral wealth. Many of our chief trade routes centre here. You are the natural shipping port especially in winter for very large sections of our territory. You lie within very easy distance of our chief cities, and of the most populous portions of our Dominion. In one word, given free trade with Canada, and you rise at one stride from the position in some respects of a frontier city with no great extent of territory secured to you, to that of a central entrepot, with the practical monopoly of a great region behind you whose commerce no man can take away from you."

The gentleman presiding over the meeting said:

"Our Liberal friends, Fielding and Longley, of Nova Scotia, Davies of Prince Edward Island, Mercier and Laurier of Quebec, Cartwright of Ontario, and a host beside, look to us, the people of the United States, for the sign by which they shall conquer. Can we deny them. The whole region of Canada will, when this commercial union is established, become as if she were so many vast territories added to our domain, and up and down a continent the world will see the result of an unrestricted trade in all that continent produces, natural or manufactured."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. An hon. member says "hear, hear," and so was the hon. member for South Oxford cheered when he was announced as the Senator for Ontario. The Attorney General for Nova Scotia, not to be outdone by the hon. member for South Oxford, spoke as follows:—

"Under such a policy as that American fishermen may enter Canadian waters at will and take all the fish they can find. Under such a policy they can enter Canadian ports for bait and supply, and send all the fish they require to markets at home."

If hon. gentlemen think the Attorney General spoke with authority on that occasion they have only to look at the representation of the counties in Nova Scotia interested in those questions, and they will find how we deal with men even suspected of treason in the provinces down by the sea. I may be prejudiced in the view I take of the utterances of the Liberal party; but you will find in the United States there are men who consider those references lead in the same direction that I have submitted they lead. Mr. Hoar, Chairman of the Committee, and a gentleman whose name has been alluded to in the correspondence on 13th March, 1889, during a discussion respecting the appointment of a committee to consider the question of trade relations between Canada and the United States, said:

"It is useless for us to be blind to the fact, and no discretion requires us to be silent in regard to the fact that there is a large and growing body of men in Canada who desire annexation to this country. Political power is likely to turn and hinge upon that question in the near future in the Dominion of Canada, and upon the question whether the American people desire such annexation or not. Nobody proposes to accomplish it without the free and intelligent and instructed will of both countries. It was impossible for the Committee on Foreign Relations, it was impossible for any other general committee of this body to enter upon, and still more impossible to exhaust the field of enquiry which this committee proposes to itself."

As showing how these movements are watched in that country, I find Mr. Morrill stating:

"The senator has made his statement, but my idea is that the whole agitation of this subject is preposterous. There never was a time when the Canadians were more intensely loyal than they are to-day to the British Government, and the idea that we can, by starting any measure here, break down the Tory Government and enable the Liberals to supersede it in Canada, is entirely, in my judgment, without any foundation."

I can give this House proof after proof, not only from the *Tribune*, but from members of Congress and Senators, that there they regard the movement of the Liberals of this country as a movement against Great Britain and in favour of the United States, ultimately ending in annexation, just as the leaders in this fight who met them and who vanquished them in battle believed their doctrines tended. If that is so, if this is the belief not only of hon. gentlemen in this House and the electors in this country, but of people in the neighbouring republic, surely the man whether official or politician or both who says so, and in so saying agrees with Mr. Blake the late leader of the Liberal party, is hardly deserving of the censure of this House. I have attempted to deal with the general question and the real question submitted to the people and decided by them, but I cannot sit down, in justice to the man who has been attacked and who is now absent, without asking the further indulgence of the House while I ask the attention of hon. members to another phase of the question. I have dealt with the charge of treason. I have shown it was a charge levied at the leaders and not at the party or at the people, and it was not a charge made by Sir Charles Tupper alone. It was a charge endorsed, as I said, by the people of Canada; whether they meant it or not was another thing, but the language they used and the efforts they were making had but one result. Now,

then, Sir Charles Tupper is not believed by the hon. gentlemen who wish to indict him. I would observe that it is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite in many cases to make a charge, and they then, through their press and by one innuendo and another, ask that their suspicions be confirmed without proof. In this instance hon. gentlemen opposite say they believe Mr. Seargeant and they take Mr. Seargeant's statement as to what occurred between Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Seargeant, but they refuse to accept Sir Charles Tupper's contradiction or statement, confirmed as it is by Mr. Hector Cameron, a gentleman who once sat in this House. I believe notwithstanding this that there are hon. gentlemen in this House who, whether they sympathize politically with Sir Charles Tupper or not, are not ready to condemn him, when he has set up a denial, in the absence of any enquiry or investigation either formal or ordinary at the hands of this House. Sir Charles Tupper asked, what I take it a Canadian would have granted quickly, namely, an opportunity to meet face to face with Sir Henry Tyler whom he had impeached and to discuss the question with him before the people most interested. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the injury done the Grand Trunk Railway, let me remind them that there are a large number of men in England who own stock in the Grand Trunk Railway who sympathize with Sir Charles Tupper in his exposure of the management of the Grand Trunk Railway by the present board of directors. These stockholders supported Sir Charles Tupper in his attitude, and Sir Henry Tyler would not give an opportunity to Sir Charles Tupper of making good the charges he had preferred, and which, as he claims and as the full correspondence shows, were made in the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway, although they were certainly to the detriment of the men who, as he conceived, are mismanaging it so grossly. Sir Charles Tupper states in one of those letters that he was prepared to meet Sir Henry Tyler, and that he had asked for the opportunity, but that he had never got it. As to the visit which he made to Mr. Seargeant, he makes the following statement, and I claim on his behalf that it should be accepted, no matter what some hon. gentlemen may think, until they have some proper evidence before the House to contradict it. Sir Charles Tupper says:

"Sir Henry Tyler says he will be prepared to expose the inaccuracies of my speech at Amherst, of which you published a cable summary, on March 9.

"In reply, I beg to inform Sir Henry Tyler that my remarks on that occasion were deliberately made, in discharge of what I considered to be my duty to Canada and to the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that I will be ready to maintain their accuracy in the presence of the shareholders of his company, at any time, after my return to London, when he will afford me an opportunity of meeting them.

"Sir Henry Tyler has favoured your readers with a very inaccurate account of my visit to Mr. Seargeant, which, if true, is irrelevant. I did not go 'cap in hand' to Mr. Seargeant, but visited that gentleman at his own invitation, sent to me by Mr. Hector Cameron, Q.C., for the purpose of discussing a question in which they were both deeply interested—that of a subsidy to facilitate the Grand Trunk Railway Company in reaching Halifax, and upon which Mr. Seargeant admits I refused to give any pledge, except that Sir John A. Macdonald would submit their proposal to his colleagues after the elections.

"Mr. Cameron was present during the interview, and reported the substance of it in writing to Sir John A. Macdonald. Mr. Seargeant has seen that report, and confirmed its accuracy. That report shows that I made no request 'to Mr. Seargeant to issue instructions to his officers and employés to vote for the Government.' All that I asked

Mr. Seargeant to do was to recall the instructions he had given to them to do all they could against the Government, and to inform them that those who desired to support the Government were at liberty to do so.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Where is the evidence of these instructions?

Mr. TUPPER. Where is the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper's statement as to which the hon. gentleman asked the condemnation of this House? Which evidence should be first produced—the evidence against Sir Charles Tupper or the evidence in his favour? Is the hon. gentleman's law as bad as his philosophy or his English? I ask hon. gentlemen who have singled out Sir Charles Tupper for attack because he came here at the request of the Government and did his duty, to give attention to this. He continues:

"How that just demand from a Government to which the Grand Trunk Railway Company was so deeply indebted was responded to, may be learned from Sir John A. Macdonald's statement, in the *Times*, on March the 13, as follows:—'Sir Charles Tupper, in a speech at Amherst, on Monday last, referred to the attitude of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the recent contest. His observations were fully justified by facts. The Government lost several seats in Ontario by the hostile course of that company which went to shameful extremes.'

"Sir Henry Tyler's letter is rather remarkable for what it does not contain. Evasive as it is, he does not venture to say that he did not instruct the management in Canada to do all they could to support an Opposition which had put discrimination against England in favour of a foreign country upon its banner. He has not favoured you with a copy of Mr. Seargeant's manifesto supporting the Opposition or the public statement of an Englishman. Mr. Reeves, the General Traffic Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in Chicago, who said:

"It is true that we carried between 150 and 200 Canucks to Canada a day or two before the elections. We also carried several hundred from various points on the line in Indiana and Michigan. They went to Canada for the purpose of voting the Liberal ticket, which favour a closer union with the United States. I am not ashamed of it. I am an annexationist and have been for twenty years. I would like to see the Stars and Strips floating over every mile of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific systems. I wish we had been able to muster thousands more. As it was, we could not muster enough, for the elections went against us. I see now, however, that I made a mistake in not working harder. I ought to have organized bureaus, and induced every Canuck in the Western States to have gone and voted against Macdonald and that traitor Van Horne. As it is I don't think we persuaded over five or six hundred to go home and vote. You can say that I have done nothing that I am ashamed of, unless it was that I did not work hard enough."

Is that conduct not to be denounced? Is it to be supposed, setting aside the main question involved in that controversy, that the Government of this country will allow even the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, not merely to actively oppose it through its influence over its men, but to coerce their employes and to bring in from the United States on a crisis like this men living and residing there free of charge in order to try and oust the Government of the day. A more indecent position for a corporation to take could hardly be conceived.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but I have no doubt that people who are able to judge fairly between the two parties will be ready to believe that if the Canadian Pacific Railway undertook to act in that way, when these hon. gentlemen opposite got into power their first act would be to denounce in the most vigorous manner such improper interference by any large corporation holding the privileges which these railway companies do.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is improper only on one side.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says it is improper only on one side. I am not discussing their support either to one party or the other, but I say Sir Charles Tupper has a right to be believed, he has a right to ask credence at the hands of his opponents until they formally confute his utterances by an enquiry properly organized and conducted. He has insisted that all he denounced is the coercion exercised by that company over their employes, their exercise of an improper influence against the Government of the day, and their refusal to issue instructions that their employes could vote as they pleased. That is the position Sir Charles Tupper has taken up, and instead of these hon. gentlemen denouncing him—if they were not desperate as I believe them to be, and if they were not actuated by only political considerations—they should join Sir Charles Tupper and the Canadian Government in resisting such interference on the part of a corporation such as the Grand Trunk Railway. Another statement is as follows:—

"Mr. Corby, one of the supporters of the Government, requested Mr. Wainwright, a high official of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to allow their employes to exercise their judgment in casting their votes. He received the following reply:—

"MONTREAL, 4th March, 1891.

"Yours received. The company's policy not being in accord with the Government party, I am unable to assist you in the present contest. The staff, I presume, knows what the interests of the company are. It is not a personal matter in any way.

"W. WAINWRIGHT."

On the face of it the answer reads fairly enough. The request was, however, based evidently on the knowledge that influence was being exerted, that coercion was attempted. Fair and manly instructions were desired, and those instructions were refused. The Government candidate at Lévis makes this statement:

"My intimate friends in Lévis have requested me to expose to you what the Grand Trunk Company did in the last election. At first I was assured that there would be no interference with the opinions of the electors. But on Tuesday afternoon, the second day preceding votation, two of their principal men came down by express train from Richmond, where they had been working for the Hon. W. Laurier, and on Wednesday, the coercion was such upon the employes of this company that according to my revisers we were at a loss of about 125 to 140 votes."

There is a statement as to coercion, and it was with this statement that the High Commissioner was dealing. With regard to extravagance, that has been alluded to. No hon. gentleman who has asked for his explanation of that part of his attack has given Sir Charles Tupper's own statement. It is this:

"Sir Henry Tyler knows that I referred to the original construction of the Grand Trunk Railway, which was so marked by 'extravagance, jobbery, and corruption' as to waste an enormous sum of money, and involve those who had furnished the capital in all but a total loss. The 188 miles of road from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, which the Government engineer estimated could be built equal to the rest of the Intercolonial Railway for about £372,000, cost the Grand Trunk shareholders no less than £944,000.

In conclusion, permit me to say that I considered it an imperative duty to Canada and the Empire to make the remarks I did at Amherst. I knew the misrepresentation and abuse to which I would be subjected, but having devoted thirty-six years of my life in untiring efforts to build up and consolidate a great and powerful British community in North America, I felt that I should fail in my duty if I did not expose this attempt of a great corporation, sustained by Englishmen, at a most important

crisis, to strike down the Government who were maintaining British interests and British institutions, in support of a party whose avowed policy was free trade with a foreign country, and discrimination against England which, as Mr. Blake—the most eminent man in the Liberal party—has admitted, must inevitably lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States and the loss to Britain of one of the most important portions of her Empire. Canada has a right to know whether 23,000 shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway sustain the admitted policy of Sir Henry Tyler and Mr. Seargeant of looking to Washington."

Now, the only additional statement from the pen of the High Commissioner to which I would call attention, in conclusion, is the statement upon which hon. gentlemen opposite based the accusation that he had alluded to the Liberal party as "ruined gamblers." Well, there are opinions as to whether they are or are not. If the judgment of the House is to be passed upon him for having said that, well and good; but why was the letter not laid on the Table in which that statement was made? Why was resort made to the columns of the *Toronto Globe*? Would that paper be received in the smallest court in the country as furnishing evidence for the meanest case that could possibly be tried? The statement to which the hon. gentleman referred was but a cablegram. There was nothing in that paper purporting to be a full statement of the passage referred to. But here is the letter, published in the *London Times*; and since hon. gentlemen found the shoes to fit them, of course they put them on. But the High Commissioner did not call them "ruined gamblers;" he applied the term to allies of their leaders, to men who were engaged with them in the fight, and it is because these hon. gentlemen believe that what is applied to Messrs. Wiman and Farrer is applicable to them that they have spoken so indignantly. But this is what the High Commissioner says:

"I have shown that Sir Henry Tyler—like Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice all his wife's relations to the war—having by his fatuous mismanagement reduced his company to the greatest straits, turned his back upon the Government, which according to his own letter had saved the Grand Trunk Company, and united with Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, who were suggesting to the United States the means of reducing the Grand Trunk Company to bankruptcy, in an attempt to subvert British institutions in Canada. Fortunately for Canada, and for the Empire to which it belongs, this last throw of these ruined gamblers has not been successful, and their designs now stand revealed."

How hon. gentlemen could apply that language to themselves, unless the language actually fits the case, and includes them with Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, is something I leave them to explain. But I know that in the province from which I come the few who have been able to come to this House and throw in their lot with hon. gentlemen opposite had to protest that they had no sympathy with unrestricted reciprocity as defined in the west by Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Laurier and others, in so far as it involved a common tariff against Great Britain. There is not one member from that province who will read the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this House some time ago on what commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity mean, and who will say that he adopts that definition, and the reason is, that while in the Province of Nova Scotia there may even be found men who are disloyal to Canada, though I am glad to say that feeling is fast fading away from the minds of all, there are not as many men as you could count on your fingers, or any men whose names would be known

in this House, who are disloyal to Great Britain; and it is for that reason that the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper on this question received such an endorsement at the hands of the people of the Province of Nova Scotia. I cannot resume my seat without thanking the House for the great indulgence—for it is an indulgence—which they have accorded to me in doing what was distasteful to myself, and I have no doubt to many in this Chamber in one respect,—that was, to make such frequent references to long extracts. My reasons were good. In the first place, I thought that those documents ought to be before this House, and then the verdict could be as it might; and in the second place, I felt that the language that summed up all the views of the High Commissioner as given by him would be language on which he would be content to take not only the verdict of his countrymen, as he has taken it, but the verdict of this House as well.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I shall say but very little with reference to the speech which has just been made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I shall allude to some of his observations, however, before I conclude what I have to say on the resolution moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has addressed to the House a very long speech; but I think it will be very difficult for the hon. gentlemen who are sitting behind him to ascertain what relevancy that speech, or the greater portion of it, has to the amendment which my hon. friend has put into your hands. The hon. gentleman has delivered here a stump speech. He has given extracts from newspapers and from speeches, some of which are old, having been delivered in this House nearly a quarter of a century ago; but what relation they have to the charges made against the High Commissioner it will be very difficult for hon. gentlemen on either side of the House to determine. The hon. the Minister of Justice delivered a speech to the House, the manner of which I have nothing to find fault with; but I disagree with the observations he made in opposing the resolution moved by my hon. friend. He said, in effect, that there is no evidence of the accuracy of the complaint contained in that resolution. He said we have no evidence before us that Sir Charles Tupper has either denounced any of the leaders of the Opposition or the members of the Reform party, or has assailed the Grand Trunk corporation or its managers. The hon. the Minister of Customs, however, did not altogether agree with that view, for I noticed that when the hon. member for South Oxford was addressing the House, the Minister of Customs expressed, quite incidentally, his opinion that those charges were true. I can well understand the silence of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches when the Minister of Justice affirms that there is no evidence of any of the statements complained of having been made at all and the hon. Minister of Customs says that the charge is true.

Mr. BOWELL. Do not pervert what I said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have no desire whatever to do that; and if I have misapprehended the Minister of Customs, he will, of course, at a later period, correct me. I admit I have sympathy with the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I

admit that his task is a difficult one, all the more difficult because what is affirmed in the amendment is quite within the truth. I sympathize with him also because his many colleagues, able to take part in this discussion, who sit on the Treasury benches beside him, instead of coming to the defence of the High Commissioner left that task to the hon. gentleman. I do not concur in the statement made by the Minister of Justice that although the office of High Commissioner is non-political the officer is not. I do not at all agree with the contention that the High Commissioner is not a civil servant. Why, under our constitutional system we have two classes of servants of the Crown. There are the civil servants of the Crown and military servants of the Crown. I think it is perfectly clear that the High Commissioner is not a military servant of the Crown, but a civil servant and nothing more; and he is not a servant of the Crown, having behind him the support of the people as a representative. Therefore his position is non-political; and if it is intended at all that it shall be permanent, as was intimated when the appointment was made, then it is perfectly clear he has no right whatever to mingle in the ordinary political strifes of the hour. The hon. gentleman has himself again and again admitted the accuracy of this contention; he has himself admitted that his position is not unlike that of an ordinary ambassador, that his duties are of an ambassadorial character, and that as far as the representative of a dependency at the capital of the Empire can be ambassadorial, his duties are of that character. Now, it is well known that an ambassador does not take part and is not supposed to take part in the ordinary strifes between the political parties in his own country, any more than he is supposed to take part in the political contests of the state to which he is accredited. It is only a few years ago since Sir Austin Henry Layard, the British ambassador at Constantinople, took strong grounds against the policy of the Government of Mr. Gladstone, and the moment a change took place in the Imperial policy on the Eastern question Mr. Layard was removed and superseded by Mr. Elliott: so that the principle is well recognized that if there is any party who ought to abstain from political contests in order that he may be readily approached by any person, no matter to what political party he may belong, at the capital to which he is accredited, it is the party holding a position such as that now held by the High Commissioner. If parties on this side of the House should have in England grievances which they might think it necessary to bring under the attention of the High Commissioner he should be as easily approached by them as by those to whom they are politically opposed; and it is impossible he can retain that position unless he abstains from taking part in political contests. Why, the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House to-night an argument which, if it had any value at all, would be just as applicable to Sir Charles Tupper as Lieutenant Governor of Ontario as it would be to him in his position of High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Charles Tupper freely took part in political questions at issue in this country, that he expressed opinions upon them, that his views upon those subjects had been subjected to criticism since he left the House. That may be equally true of a Lieutenant Governor, or of a gentleman appointed to the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Bench who was formerly a member of this House; and the hon. gentleman might, with as much propriety, defend the conduct of a judge or a Lieutenant Governor taking part in a political contest as that of the High Commissioner.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman's argument, but he has not seized the point I made. It was not that hon. gentlemen opposite had discussed the views formerly held by Sir Charles Tupper, but that they were continuing to discuss and misrepresent the views he held at the time of that discussion, when he was in England, holding different views from his colleagues on the trade questions that then came up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The hon. gentleman does not accurately state the position taken on this side. We all know what happened in this House. We know the position taken by the Minister of Justice with reference to putting certain articles on the free list, and we know what the Government said in that matter. We know also what Sir Charles Tupper said within a week after he came back and took his seat as Minister of Finance, and what took place after communication was had by telegraph with the Government at Washington. But those were subjects of discussion in this House after Sir Charles Tupper returned to England and resumed his duties of High Commissioner; and I say that he was not justified in entering the political arena, because this continued to be a live controversy between gentlemen on the Treasury benches and gentlemen on this side, because at one moment of time he happened himself to have been connected with that controversy. Now, what we complain of in this matter is that, while Sir Charles Tupper is the paid servant of the Crown, holding a non-political office, he has become the agent of one party and the vilifier of the other party. All the hon. gentleman has said shows that Sir Charles Tupper has vilified gentlemen on this side of the House, and that he is himself prepared to join him in that vilification. I say that, no matter what his views may be in regard to the conduct and policy of gentlemen on this side of the House, if Sir Charles Tupper wished to take part in the controversy or to wage war against any party in this country he ought to have tendered his resignation, to have withdrawn from the office and to have taken the responsibility of meeting those gentlemen in this House as a member of this House in discussing those charges which he brought against them. That is not his position. He has simply assumed a position, which is discreditable to the Government, which is discreditable to himself, of being the paid opponent of those who are in opposition to the Government. He has simply drawn his salary as a stump speaker on behalf of the Administration, and I say that is a position wholly unworthy of one who holds the office of High Commissioner and receives a salary of \$12,000 a year for the discharge of the duties of that office. We know that, in 1887, the hon. gentleman returned to this country without resigning his office, that he became Minister of Finance, that he still held the office of High Commissioner, that he then resigned his position as Minister of Finance and returned to England and undertook again to discharge the duties of High Commissioner. It is true that during that time he only drew the salary of a Minister, but his conduct showed that the office of High Commissioner might

be left in a condition of suspended animation for a considerable time without the country suffering anything. In the campaign of 1891 the hon. gentleman returned again, and the reason given for his coming out is that he was not an ordinary civil servant of the Crown. I deny that altogether. I say there is no such distinction. I say that there is only one class of civil servants of the Crown who are permitted to engage in party warfare, and that is the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. They have that right, but Sir Charles Tupper is not a representative of the people, he is not a legislator in the other House, he has no more right to take part in the political warfare carried on in an election than the Deputy Minister who presides in any one of the departments of State in this capital. The Minister of Justice informed us that there was no evidence that Sir Charles Tupper imputed any disloyal conduct to those who sit on this side of the House, that we had nothing to complain of on this side of the House. I think we are entitled to take notice of what that hon. gentleman said when he was addressing the electors of this country. While he was at Windsor he was subjected to an interview by a representative of the *Detroit Free Press*. I believe that he himself prepared the report for that paper, and I have that report before me. What statement did he make in that interview in regard to one hon. member of this House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)?

Mr. TUPPER. Is not that a comic paper?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; it is not a comic paper. He is asked the question: "What effect will the Farrer article have on these elections?" The elections had not yet occurred, recollect. He replies: "It is the death-blow of Gritism." We know what he called "Gritism." It is the views entertained by the Opposition, by the party known by those who hold its views as Reformers, and designated by hon. gentlemen opposite as Grits:

"It is the death-blow of Gritism. Mr. Farrer is the guide, philosopher and friend of Sir Richard Cartwright. He has been sent to Washington time and again—"

Not that he went of his own accord, but that he was sent by the gentleman who employed him, who was his master, according to Sir Charles Tupper's representation.

"—He has been sent to Washington time and again as the agent of Mr. Cartwright—"

Where is the evidence of that? The hon. gentleman challenged the production of proof before a committee. Where is the proof?—

"—to carry out the nefarious plot, and the exposure has shown the Canadian people what these people would do."

What what people would do? Why, the Grits, of whom Sir Richard Cartwright was a leader and of whose views and desires he was a prominent exponent. It is impossible to read that extract and accept the statement of the Minister of Justice, or to limit the charge, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has tried to limit it. It is clear that Sir Charles Tupper did charge, at all events, one of the leaders of the Liberal party and those whom he designated as Grits as seeking political annexation to the United States, and he refers to Mr. Farrer in no other capacity than as a mere instrument in the hands of other parties. It is absurd, after a statement of that kind has been made, to undertake to argue that Sir Charles Tupper's charges related simply

to Mr. Wiman and Mr. Farrer, because Mr. Farrer himself is spoken of as being the mere instrument here in the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Then, when we look at an article contributed to the *Contemporary Review* by Sir Charles Tupper we find the same charges repeated. We find that the High Commissioner associates Sir Richard Cartwright and my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) as the parties of whom Mr. Wiman and Mr. Hitt and Mr. Farrer are the mere instruments; and yet we are told that the Opposition have nothing to complain of, that these charges referred to parties outside, and that, if we do not feel we are guilty, and are associated in these nefarious enterprises with them, we are not charged at all. That is not so. It is perfectly clear that the High Commissioner did not intend to be so understood. It was not simply at Mr. Farrer, or Mr. Hitt, or Mr. Wiman, that the High Commissioner was aiming his blows; they were aimed at the hon. member for South Oxford, at my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Laurier), and those hon. gentlemen in this House who entertain similar views as to the trade policy of this country. Why, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to argue that the views which we entertain on the subject of trade necessarily point in the direction of annexation. Well, Sir, we are equally strong in the conviction that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued for the past twelve years, necessarily points to annexation. Nothing can be clearer than this. By that policy you have sent a million of people over the border; you have made them citizens of the United States; you have annexed them to the United States; and do you suppose that if you persist in that policy, which will shortly carry half the population beyond the border, you can ever keep these people politically separate? If that system is persisted in you will have at some period in the near future one-half the people of Canada arrayed against the other half. But while I have strong opinions as to the tendency of the commercial policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not say that they have entered upon that policy with the design of bringing about these results, which I think in the end are likely to follow from that policy if nothing unforeseen intervenes. But that is not their position towards us. True, some hon. gentlemen on the other side, broad in their views, charitable in their feelings, say that they think the tendency of our policy is in the direction of closer political relations with the United States, but they do not charge us with deliberately aiming at any such result. But that is not the position of Sir Charles Tupper. His position is that a great conspiracy existed, and that he has come out to this country, as Sir Don Quixote, for the purpose of preventing that conspiracy being consummated. His object and aim, his patriotic endeavour, has been to prevent the Opposition, and the leaders of the Opposition, from carrying the people of this country into political union with the United States. Well, however widely the people may differ as to the views which he entertains—as to the accuracy of his conclusions—they would attach more importance to their disinterested character if he had resigned his position and had come out here without his office and assumed all the responsibility of placing his views before the people, as an ordinary citizen of this country. But that is not

what he did. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has undertaken to defend the conduct of the High Commissioner in his attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk Railway Company and its officials into giving the influence of that corporation to the support of the Administration. He says that Sir Charles Tupper has denied that charge, and we ought to accept that denial; but the wonder always has been what brought Sir Charles Tupper and the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company into communication with each other on the subject; what gave rise to this interview? The hon. Minister has told us to-night that Sir Charles Tupper simply asked that the Grand Trunk Railway Company should withdraw that order which they had issued against the Administration. Has that order been published? Has Sir Charles Tupper given to this House or the country any evidence of the existence of that order? It is assumed that a certain order existed, but he has given the country no evidence of any such order. On the contrary, Mr. Seargeant and Sir Henry Tyler both declare that no such order ever was issued, and yet he pretends to tell us that Sir Charles Tupper went simply to ask those gentlemen to withdraw an order that he could not have seen, that had no existence, and to place the Conservative party upon a footing of equality with their political opponents.

Mr. HAGGART. When did Mr. Seargeant say so? Where did you get any authority of his for your statement?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think I have seen it. I will read an extract in due time from Sir Henry Tyler upon the subject, and I think that upon a subject relating to the administration of the company, the declarations of Sir Henry Tyler and Mr. Seargeant are to be taken as true so long as there is no evidence produced to the contrary. When such declarations were made, if Sir Charles Tupper had seen any such order, it was easy for him to have confuted Sir Henry Tyler by the production of that order. But, Sir, I think I know something with regard to the conduct of another powerful corporation in this country; I think I have seen from the manager of that railway corporation a manifesto against anything like unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. And yet if I am to judge by the uniform conduct of that company, there is no portion of our population that have made greater efforts to secure intercourse with our neighbours than that corporation itself. I am making no complaint, but I state that that corporation has put forth extraordinary efforts for the purpose of securing a portion of the American trade. It is seeking in every possible way to secure unrestricted reciprocity, so far as its own interests are concerned, with the people of the United States; and certain advice was given, and a certain course was pursued, of which we have made no complaint, but which I think was very unfair indeed to the people of this country and to the Liberal party, and the more so because the conduct of the corporation itself was at variance with the doctrines which it preached as being good for other people. There is a complaint made by Sir Charles Tupper that the Grand Trunk Railway Company issued free tickets to those who were politically opposed to his party, in order that they

might reach the polls. Sir Henry Tyler says in reference to that charge:

"Sir Charles Tupper has already been informed that though a telegram was sent by Mr. Edgar authorizing the issue of tickets previously guaranteed to be paid for, those tickets were not actually issued, and this cannot be considered more heinous than the running of special trains ordered for his (Sir Charles Tupper's) own purposes, which trains have not yet been paid for, the account of which is still waiting settlement."

It will be an interesting question to know by whom that bill is to be paid, whether it is to be paid by Sir Charles Tupper, whether it is to be paid by contributions of the hon. gentlemen who have profited by his efforts, or whether it is to be paid out of the public treasury of this country. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries complains of the "indecent haste," the "spleen," the "spite," the "malice." What do all these words mean? The hon. gentleman, perhaps, will give us a lecture on synonyms, and tell us whether this is good English or not, tell us whether these are synonymous expressions or not. He will also, perhaps, tell us, with a filial regard for what is due to another, what "craven cowards" mean. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will take his own speech and take the letters of his distinguished parent and put them together, he will find ample material for a criticism upon the subject, if he is disposed to turn his attention in that direction. I might say to the hon. gentleman that while I have no ill-will towards him, and I admit that he has shown good ability as a member of the Government, I do not think that lectures on the Queen's English are in his line, nor do I think he is calculated to shine in that direction. The hon. gentleman complained this evening of the use of the expression an "unveracious calumniator," and he seems to think that it is not good English. I do not know on what ground the hon. gentleman's claim is based; whether he means to say that unveracious is not English, or calumniator is not English, or the combination is not English.

Mr. TUPPER. The combination.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman will remember that Shakespeare makes one of his characters say with respect to the communication from the witches that they lied like the truth.

An hon. MEMBER. You are not Shakespeare.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). While that might not be a calumnious statement it might be an unveracious one. The hon. gentleman might also remember that calumnies are often conveyed by a shrug of the shoulders, and by pretending to conceal something which, if told, might have a very different effect. While I should say an action like that might be calumnious, I would not say it was an unveracious calumny, nor the party who used it was an unveracious calumniator. But when an hon. gentleman is very specific, though not very accurate, in the use of his English, and when he undertakes to state what is not the fact, and when he is very precise in that statement, I am inclined to think he is not only a calumniator, when the statement he makes is an untrue one, but he is an unveracious calumniator. And, although I have no intention of entering into a discussion on the subject of synonyms or on the use of quotations, I think I can satisfy the hon. gentleman, if he wished to discuss the subject, that unveracious calumniator is very good English, and it does not apply to every untruthful state-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

ment, but it does apply, and apply with perfect accuracy, to untruthful statements of a certain class made in a particular way. The hon. gentleman has spoken of interference in the elections by members of the Local Governments, and he has declared that they have interfered quite as improperly as the High Commissioner. Members of the Local Governments are not our officers. They have reached their position by the votes of the people. They are responsible to the people who appointed them, not to us. If the people disapprove of their conduct they will remove them no doubt in the proper way, and if we disapprove of the conduct of the High Commissioner it seems to me we ought to adopt a similar policy. The hon. gentleman made a very extraordinary interruption in the speech made a few evenings ago by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He undertook to justify a statement made by the Minister of Justice in a memorandum in regard to the action of Newfoundland, in which the Minister pointed out that the United States had laid down a doctrine that Canada cannot avail itself of the United States markets, while our people continue their allegiance as British subjects; and the hon. gentleman, not satisfied with the statement of the Minister of Justice, that he had based that observation on a speech delivered by Mr. Blaine some three years ago, interrupted the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and read an extract from Mr. Blaine's speech, to show it was impossible we could have access to United States markets unless we became American citizens. That was the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Now the hon. gentleman will perhaps tell us how, under these circumstances the High Commissioner and two of his colleagues came to go to Washington. Did they start on a fool's errand? Did they know beforehand what Mr. Blaine had said and feel confidence that they possessed in it conclusive evidence as to the position of the United States on this question? If that be so, what did the High Commissioner, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance mean by those two trips to Washington? Did they go to seek the annexation of this country to the United States? Did they go to assure the United States Government they would lay aside their allegiance to the British Government for the purpose of securing reciprocity in trade? Were they prepared for the mere advantage of securing material prosperity to give up their allegiance to Great Britain? What mean these negotiations in the face of this extract from Mr. Blaine's speech, which the Minister of Marine considers so perfectly conclusive? I am not going to discuss the tendency of this or that particular policy. I am disposed to consider what I believe to be best for the material prosperity of this country, trusting to the future to lead us along that line which will be in the end best for us. I am not going to assist in opposing what I believe to be in the interests of our people because some hon. gentleman is afraid they may lead him where he does not want to go. I do not think a more improper course could be pursued on any question, and I am not disposed to take it on this, and I do not think the people are inclined to take that view. Hon. members will recollect that in an interview the High Commissioner declared the Liberal party would be swept out of existence, because it was impossible they could support the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir

Richard Cartwright) and those who held to the policy of unrestricted reciprocity without at the same time supporting political union with the United States. In the face of that declaration, here is the fact that a majority of the members of old Canada sit on this side of the House. If that be true, then it is clear, according to the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, that the majority of the people of this country, or at all events of old Canada, are seeking political union with the neighbouring republic. I do not admit that conclusion, I deny it altogether. I maintain that the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper does great injustice not only to the Liberal party but to the people of this country, by the false impression it is calculated to make in the mother country. The High Commissioner has published letters attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, has published articles in the *Contemporary Review* and the *North American Review* attacking the Liberal party, intimating that that party was led by men who are seeking to bring about the political union of Canada with the United States. That is the object he is aiming at; he has laboured steadily to damage the Liberal party in the minds of the English people. It is a position that cannot be tolerated, and the Liberal party will continue to protest against this country being represented in a non-political office by a gentleman which has slandered the members on either side of the House. I am not speaking in the interests of the Liberal party in denouncing the position taken by Sir Charles Tupper, whose charges are calumnious and whose statements are altogether unfounded, but in making this statement I declare I am as ready to denounce similar charges made by any officer of the Civil Service of this country as well against hon. gentlemen opposite, as against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to deal out to us the same measure of justice they may desire to have dealt out to them if they were in our position, as they undoubtedly will be very soon.

Mr. DICKEY. The discussion upon this question has taken a somewhat wide range and I do not propose to follow it in its irrelevancy. Before proceeding to discuss the resolution I will first address myself to some remarks which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made towards the latter part of his speech. The hon. gentleman seemed to make much ado of the fact that the Minister of Marine had read to the House a speech of Mr. Blaine's in order to prove that the United States Secretary of State would not accept reciprocity, and the hon. member for Bothwell desired to know how the Minister of Marine expected that the Commissioners of the Government could go to Washington with any hope of getting reciprocity in view of that declaration by Mr. Blaine. In my opinion it would be much better that the hon. member for Bothwell—before he made those remarks at the expense of the Minister of Justice—had read the speech of Mr. Blaine to which the Minister of Marine referred. I will again quote to the House part of the speech of Mr. Blaine which the Minister of Marine read, and I think they will see from that speech that what Mr. Blaine objects to, is the unrestricted reciprocity which members on the other side of the House advocate, and not the limited reciprocity which the Government is endeavouring to obtain. Mr. Blaine says:

"Beyond the frontier, across the river our neighbours chose another Government, another allegiance. They are

subjects of Queen Victoria; they are loyal to Her Majesty. They live under a foreign flag. They do exactly as they have a right to do. I neither dispute their right nor envy their situation. It is their right to choose for themselves, as it is our right to choose for ourselves. But I am opposed, teetotally opposed, to giving the Canadians the sentimental satisfaction of waving the British flag, paying British taxes, and enjoying the actual cash remuneration of American markets. They cannot have both at the same time. If they come to us they can have what we have, but it is an absolute wrong against the rights of American citizens that millions of men who owe the United States no allegiance, who have no part or lot with us, who are not of us, but choose to be foreign to us; it is an absolute wrong for Congress to say that they shall have exactly the same share in our markets and the same privileges of trade under our flag that we have. So far as I can help it I do not mean that they shall be Canadians and Americans at the same time."

If the hon. member for Bothwell will study that speech he will find that Mr. Blaine has not said one word against the fair reciprocity treaty which the Government in Canada are anxious to obtain. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) went over a good deal of ground in his speech, and it was well that some time elapsed between the beginning and the close of his remarks, else his charge of irrelevancy against the speech of the hon. Minister of Justice might have been made against himself with a good deal of force. The hon. gentleman treated on the position which the High Commissioner occupies in reference to the Government, and he held that the High Commissioner was in the capacity of an ambassador. Now, for the last few years in this Parliament, I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite avail themselves of every occasion that offered to hold Sir Charles Tupper up as being opposed to the Government on certain important issues. The hon. member from Bothwell and his friends have argued in this House that Sir Charles Tupper was opposed to the Government on the reciprocity question, that he was willing to go further in this matter than they were, and that upon other vital questions he was opposed to the Ministry. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say now that Sir Charles Tupper was a Minister when they attacked him in this House, and out of it that he is a mere political servant of the Government, open to criticism, but when they accused him and when he comes to offer his defence to the people of Canada, before whom every public man in this country must expect to go for a verdict on his conduct, it is a sorry excuse for them to plead that he is an ambassador, and that in consequence he should be refused the opportunity of making his defence. After abusing Sir Charles Tupper during the past few years, I maintain that it is not fair that hon. gentlemen opposite should deny him the opportunity of making his defence, because they are pleased to say that he is an ambassador and that his mouth is to be closed. I am not sufficiently versed in constitutional law to know exactly what the position of the High Commissioner is with regard to the Government, but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that Sir Charles Tupper is an ambassador, and I suppose the hon. member is perfectly familiar with the fact that if he be an ambassador this House would not have any right to discuss or to vote upon his conduct. Hon. gentlemen on the other side also say that Sir Charles Tupper is a civil servant. Now waiving for a time any technical question as to what Sir Charles Tupper's position is, or what the position of High Commissioner is, let us look at the question from a common sense standpoint. It is quite

Mr. DICKEY.

clear that he is not an ordinary member of the Civil Service, for if hon. gentlemen opposite should by any chance come into power, they will admit, that while they would consider it an unjust act to turn out the deputy head of any department without cause—because he is an officer who was entitled to the protection with which custom and law surrounds the Civil Service—yet if they should come into power they would not for one moment permit Sir Charles Tupper, who had no sympathy with their views to represent them at the Court of St. James. Therefore, whatever may be the fine legal distinction in reference to the High Commissioner's office, yet from a common sense point of view there is a broad distinction between it and the position of ordinary members of the Civil Service. Sir Charles Tupper holds an office which depends upon the existence of the Government for its continuance, and he must necessarily go out with the Government whose representative he is. In that respect he stands in a distinct position from other civil servants. I observe that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in quoting evidence as to the statements of Sir Charles Tupper, had to resort to an alleged interview in the *Detroit Free Press*. We all know that interviews in American newspapers are about as unreliable evidence as can be produced in support of any assertion, and the hon. gentleman must have been very hard pressed for some corroboration of the allegations made by the other side of the House when he said that this interview bore internal evidence of having been written by Sir Charles Tupper himself. I say that the hon. member for Bothwell in advancing such a theory to this House, as evidence upon which they should base their judgment in passing a vote of censure upon Sir Charles Tupper, was trifling with the intelligence of the House. As he read the article I noticed, although I do not pretend to be a literary critic, that Sir Richard Cartwright—I use his name because it is mentioned there—was referred to in it as Mr. Cartwright, and I ask hon. gentlemen if it is likely that Sir Charles Tupper would, in writing, refer to the hon. member for South Oxford as Mr. Cartwright. The hon. member went on to say that in his judgment the National Policy led directly to annexation, and he was kind enough to tell us that he would not for that reason impute to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House any disloyalty to Great Britain or any anxiety for annexation; and he claimed in the same way that, although members on this side felt that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite led to annexation, the same courtesy should be extended to them. Well, personally I am quite willing to accord that courtesy to the hon. gentlemen. I am quite willing to admit that there were very many gentlemen working for commercial union who did not and who do not to-day realize where that policy would lead them. But I would remind the hon. member that he does not find in this country any person supporting the National Policy who is in league with people in the United States; he does not find that in the United States there is an organized band of persons favouring the National Policy in this country with the view of driving us into annexation with the United States. The argument of the hon. member for Bothwell is a mere abstract argument that the National Policy leads to annexation. But in connection with commercial union we have as the hon. Minister of

Marine has pointed out so well to-night, the evidences of a conspiracy in the United States, which no hon. gentleman opposite has attempted to deny, avowedly for the purpose of bringing Canada into a political union with that country; and we have hon. members in this House, and leaders of the Liberal party who are not in this House, rewarded for favouring the policy of commercial union with dinners given to them in the United States by those who desire the political union of the two countries. The hon. member for Bothwell referred to Sir Charles Tupper's interview with Mr. Seargeant as an attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk, and with perfectly calm indifference he waived aside altogether Sir Charles Tupper's statement with regard to that interview, in which he alleges that he made no attempt to coerce the Grand Trunk, and he also waives aside Mr. Hector Cameron's declaration in support of Sir Charles Tupper. This is the spirit in which the hon. gentleman treats Sir Charles Tupper, and in which he considers the evidence offered by the hon. Minister of Marine in Sir Charles Tupper's defence. The hon. gentleman also says that if the policy of unrestricted reciprocity leads to annexation the majority of the members of this House from old Canada are in favour of that policy, and, therefore, the majority of the people of old Canada are in favour of annexation. It may not be very much to the point, but it is quite as much to the point as the hon. gentleman's argument, and it is just as well to remind him of it that although the Opposition have perhaps a majority of the representatives of the two old provinces of Canada in this House, they represent a minority of the people from those provinces. Now, I must say that of all the many great compliments that Sir Charles Tupper has got in his public career, both from his country and his Queen, I do not know of any that does him more credit than the speech delivered by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) in this debate. That hon. gentleman, in a motion confined to the narrow issue of whether or not it was right for Sir Charles Tupper to take part in the late election, did Sir Charles Tupper the honour to go back to 1866 to rake up stale and exploded scandals against him for the purpose of damaging him in this House. The House will remember that in 1866 Sir Charles Tupper stood alone in Nova Scotia as the maker of Confederation, and was battling to bring that province into the Union, so that it could assist in building up the Canada we have to-day. In doing so he met with intense hostility from various quarters, and in the course of that bitter and stubborn fight, in which only the great ability, perseverance and tact of Sir Charles Tupper succeeded in bringing Nova Scotia into the Union, he met with such charges as have been retailed during this debate; and the hon. member for West Huron is, I conceive, doing Sir Charles Tupper great honour in reminding the House that in working patriotically for the promotion of this Confederation he faced even such calumnies as those which the hon. gentleman has uttered against him. Now, these things have been discussed again and again, for hon. members of the Opposition in Nova Scotia, in Ontario and in Quebec have again and again been offered the privilege of meeting Sir Charles Tupper on the public platform and discussing these matters before the electorate of the country. Sometimes they have accepted that offer, but more frequently they have not. I believe that the

hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declined that honour on several occasions before the people of Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When, pray? Be good enough to state.

Mr. DICKEY. I cannot give the hon. member the date, and if he denies it—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Most assuredly. I may just say to the hon. gentleman, as he puts the question, that I was never asked to meet Sir Charles Tupper; but I rather think that on two or three occasions we asked that Sir Charles Tupper should join in a sort of tournament, but he did not see fit to accept the invitation.

Mr. DICKEY. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial, and I would accept it with a good deal more grace if he had not made a statement as to which I think he must have been misinformed, namely, that Sir Charles Tupper ever declined to face him or any other man who proposed to meet him. Those various offers of Sir Charles Tupper to discuss his character and reputation before the electors of this country have, one after the other, during the last thirteen years, resulted with unvarying effect in an endorsement of Sir Charles Tupper and the policy he has been propounding. This has been particularly true in the Province of Nova Scotia where Sir Charles Tupper is best known, where he spent his younger days, and where he led a Government. To-day the party Sir Charles Tupper supported comes back to this House with sixteen out of twenty-one members from the Province of Nova Scotia and that is quite sufficient argument to meet the charges which the hon. member for West Huron has thought proper to make in this House against him. I do not know what view the hon. member for West Huron and those who, like him, go back years for the sake of hurling these exploded charges against the High Commissioner can have. Possibly they want to go down to posterity by hanging on to his coat tails, or perhaps they want to be immortalized as notorious for having assailed and vilified a man who will ever be known as one of the makers of Canada. Whether that be their aim or not, I do not know; but as regards all those charges affecting his past life, I shall say nothing specifically, because they have been answered again and again, both in this House and before the people. Now, coming to the resolution before us, it is divided into three branches. It involves the affirmation that Sir Charles Tupper interfered with the elections, that he imputed treasonable motives to a large portion of the people of Canada, and that he vilified the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, unless every hon. gentleman in this House is satisfied as to the accuracy of those statements, he cannot support this resolution. With regard to the interference of Sir Charles Tupper in the elections, I would simply justify that upon the ground of fair-play. His position having been assailed, what could be fairer than that he should appear upon the platform, willing to meet anybody in a free discussion before the electors. If he had sulked in London and had refused to discuss these questions, there might have been some imputation against him; but I hold that, from his own point of view, regarding himself simply as an individual, he had the right, under every principle of fair-play, to be heard before the people. But that is not the posi-

tion. Sir Charles Tupper came here at the request of the leader of the Government, and this resolution being a personal matter, it is, therefore, not entitled to any support. It should have been made against the Administration which brought Sir Charles Tupper out here and not against the High Commissioner. I will put it to hon. gentlemen opposite if this man is a civil servant and the Government ask him to come out and help them, what is he to do? Is he to disobey that command and be dismissed, or to come out and work as requested. Therefore the blame, if there be any in this matter, is chargeable to the Government and not to the High Commissioner. When one considers the speeches of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) and the others who discussed this question, it seems to me that an attack is made directly and personally against Sir Charles Tupper and that there is no desire to draw the Government into the matter. The evident desire is to get at Sir Charles Tupper and give the hon. member for West Huron and others a text on which to hang abusive speeches of an absent man, who, always ready to defend himself when present, cannot do so now owing to absence. If a charge is to be made against any body, it should be made against the Ministers of the Crown who are here, well able to defend themselves. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, supposing a Deputy Minister were guilty of any misconduct, what would be the force of a resolution censuring him, without any enquiry, without his being present or being given an opportunity to reply in any way. If the hon. member for Bothwell is right in holding that Sir Charles Tupper is a mere civil servant, Sir Charles Tupper stands on the same plane as a deputy head of a department, and this motion should be rejected as being a mode of enquiry which would never be sanctioned in the case of any other civil servant, and for that reason violating the first elements of fair-play. Administrations are attacked because they take the responsibility of what they do and have to defend it; but to attack in this House a civil servant behind his back, without giving him a chance to defend himself, is to violate every principle of fair-play. In the second division of the resolution, we are asked to commit ourselves to the statement that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable motives to a large proportion of the people of Canada. Now, I have listened carefully, and have never yet heard from any hon. gentleman opposite one tittle of evidence on that subject. The hon. member for South Oxford started out, as I thought pretty bravely, to prove it, but he wound up with a charge of treason against Mr. Farrer, Mr. Wiman and Sir Richard Cartwright; and as we cannot yet consider those gentlemen to be a large proportion of the people of Canada, we cannot consistently support the resolution. Why, not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken have been able to prove that Sir Charles Tupper imputed treasonable motives to a large section of our people. He said, it is true that some parties were treasonable. He imputed treason to Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, and I do not know whether any hon. gentleman on the opposite side is prepared to defend those two gentlemen. I do not know why after having received the aid of Messrs. Wiman and Farrer, hon. gentlemen opposite should, now that the battle is over, leave these friends of theirs without a defender. I do not

Mr. DICKEY.

know why they do not defend them against the charge of treason; for I have no doubt the hon. member for Bothwell could prove by the text-book and by authorities that Mr. Farrer and Mr. Wiman do not come within the definition of levying war against the Queen, and therefore are not traitors. But even that he has not attempted to prove, and these gentlemen stand charged, and I think properly, with the crime of treason. In the face of the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have not offered any evidence that Sir Charles Tupper charged the Liberal party or any considerable portion of the people with treason, we have, in the very article which the hon. member for South Oxford cited as proof of that assertion, a distinct statement by Sir Charles Tupper that no considerable part of the people of Canada are disloyal or in favour of annexation. And for the House to come to a resolution of that sort proposed would not only be violating every principle of fair-play, would not only be condemning a man in his absence, but would be condemning him against the evidence. They would be giving what a judge would call a perverse verdict, opposed to every principle of evidence. There is another view to take, and that is that, if hon. gentlemen opposite are so careful of the dignity of this Dominion, if they are so careful that no imputations of treason should be made, I invite the House to consider why they did not read the declaration of Sir Charles Tupper in those articles that he did not charge that party with treason, and why they did not refrain from placing on the Journals of the House the false statement that a man in Sir Charles Tupper's position alleged that the Liberal party were in favour of annexation? I ask them why they would allow it to go to England, to the United States, and to all the world, why they would spread the report, the scandal, the slander that Sir Charles Tupper made any such statement as this when they had the evidence that Sir Charles Tupper made no such statement, but in fact stated the very opposite? So I think if any gentlemen are to blame in this matter, in giving the idea that Canada is honeycombed with treason, they are the hon. gentlemen opposite, who, in this resolution, invite the House to resolve that Sir Charles Tupper stated publicly throughout the country that the Liberal party were committed to the policy of annexation. The third charge is that Sir Charles Tupper vilified the managers of the Grand Trunk Railway. What are the facts? Sir Charles Tupper was in Cumberland on declaration day, and, as a matter of course, being the old member of the county, and the people being glad to see him, he was invited to speak. He discussed the issues of the day and the battle which had just been fought and the reasons why in some provinces the Government had lost and why in other provinces the Government had succeeded. In going over these reasons, he naturally came to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and he discussed their conduct in opposing the Government, and, as was perfectly natural under the feelings engendered by the struggle, he did so warmly. I do not know that there is anything very much out of the way in the leader of the Opposition accusing 215 revising officers of this Dominion as being unblushing partisans. He charged them with being guilty of the most disgraceful frauds, and this language was used by him in regard to the causes of the defeat of the Liberal party. Sir Charles Tupper, in

discussing the reverses of the Conservative party in sections where the Grand Trunk Railway held sway, gave expression to his opinion of their action. I do not see anything very serious in that. In connection with that matter, Sir Charles Tupper was attacked most virulently by Sir Henry Tyler. It was asserted that he had tried to make a corrupt bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway in reference to the elections. He met that statement with a denial on his own part and also one by Hector Cameron. Various charges and counter charges were made, and what did Sir Charles Tupper do? I ask anyone who can fairly look at the question if any proposition could have been more proper than the one which he made. He said: "I will go to your own meeting, and there, before your own shareholders, before the people whose business you have been managing for years, before people with whom I have no interests, but who are intelligent Englishmen, I will discuss the charges I have made and produce the proofs I have to offer, and you shall produce whatever proofs you have to offer, and the meeting shall decide between you and me." I ask the House what fairer offer could have been made by Sir Charles Tupper or any other man. But that challenge was not accepted, and consequently Sir Charles Tupper had to write the letters, some parts of which are complained of by members of the Opposition. It only comes to this, that Sir Charles Tupper, in stating the causes of the defeat of the Government in certain places, fell foul of the Grand Trunk Railway, that Sir Henry Tyler attacked him and that he had to defend himself as best he could. After all, Sir Charles Tupper's chief complaint against the Grand Trunk Railway was that they interfered unfairly in the elections, that they did not allow their employees to vote as they wished. His statement is corroborated by Hector Cameron, and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I hold that we are bound to assume that is correct. Therefore on this head the motion is untenable. It is untenable on all grounds, but I submit that, as to the allegation that Sir Charles Tupper attributed treasonable motives to any considerable portion of the people of Canada, not only is there no evidence to support it but there is considerable evidence against it, sufficient to satisfy any one with a fair and open mind. Therefore, I appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House, whether they can come to a resolution involving a statement of fact such as appears in the middle branch of that resolution. As I said before, I think this motion should have been directed against the Government, or, if it was directed against the official, he should have had an opportunity to be heard. It involves a misstatement of facts, a statement contrary to all the evidence we have before us, and, therefore, I hope that this House will vote down a motion, which, in my opinion, was extremely ill-judged, a motion which appears to be the outcome of extreme ill-feeling against Sir Charles Tupper personally, an ill-feeling which was engendered by Sir Charles Tupper's successful efforts during the political campaign, a motion which the people of this country will see has been made on account of the success of Sir Charles Tupper's arguments and eloquence during the late campaign. I hope that a motion of this character, a motion which violates every principle of good taste and fair-play will be voted down by this House, and I

trust by an overwhelming majority. If it is so voted down, it will show that this House has a rough-and-tumble sense as to what is due between man and man, that this House has not forgotten the work Sir Charles Tupper has done, work which we know is appreciated by members on both sides of the House, work that this country in the future will be proud of and for which it would honour him to-morrow if he were struck down by sickness or death. I hope the House will not allow a man with a record like that to be treated as he would be by the adoption of such a motion as this, and I hope it will be voted down by such a majority as will make it very satisfactory to Sir Charles Tupper when he hears of it in England.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The speech which the hon. gentleman has just delivered does more credit to his heart than to his head. I would not have been disposed to follow him at all were it not for one observation which he uttered, at least three times, and which I think calls for refutation from those who are supporting the present amendment. That observation was to the effect that not a scintilla of evidence had been attempted to be offered to the House in support of the charge that the High Commissioner of this country had charged treason against a large portion of the population. That assertion of his has brought me to my feet, and I will deal with it in a few moments. If I understand the position correctly which the hon. gentleman assumed, it was that Sir Charles Tupper did not occupy, in any sense, the position of a diplomatist or an ambassador. He ventured, with the becoming modesty with which he generally speaks in this House, to say that he did not speak as a constitutional lawyer, and I suppose, to some extent, he formed his opinions upon those delivered by the Minister of Justice when he spoke. Arguing from that position, he said that the High Commissioner therefore stood in the position simply of a deputy head: and if I gathered correctly the argument which he intended to present to the House it was this: That it was perfectly proper, and a course which he would defend, for a deputy head of any of the departments to leave his office, leave unfulfilled the duties which he is paid to perform, and enter upon a campaign from one end of this country to the other, and indulge in any language he pleased to use against one political party or another.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not think that the hon. gentleman wishes to misrepresent me, but he is doing so. My argument was the very opposite. I said that Sir Charles Tupper is not a civil servant subject to a Minister, like a deputy head, and in that respect I differed from the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I fail still to understand the hon. gentleman. Will he tell us what position Sir Charles Tupper does occupy? Sir Charles Tupper does not occupy in any sense, he says, the position of ambassador or diplomatist. Now, he tells us that he does not occupy the position of a civil servant like a deputy head. What position, then, does he occupy? I think the position he occupies in the mind of the hon. gentleman is that of a man above all law and above all rule, and amenable neither to this House nor to any other authority. That is the one ground upon which he can be defended. Let us look at the position that Sir Charles Tupper really does occupy. When the Minister of

Justice assumed his defence in this House he did it upon two grounds. He was aware, he could not but be aware, that if Sir Charles Tupper did occupy the position of an ambassador or diplomatist, his conduct in the late campaign was indefensible and indecent, and the Minister of Justice took the bull by the horns and laid down what he conceived to be the position, in very clear language. He said:

"It is perfectly true that the High Commissioner holds a very high and important position in respect to this country. He is one of our public functionaries, but conceding all that, I deny the hon. gentleman's proposition that he holds any such position as a foreign ambassador occupies. A foreign ambassador must necessarily keep himself, to a great extent, free from party politics. He must avoid anything that would impair the relations between himself and the court to which he is sent, because he is a medium of communication between the Government he represents and that court. The High Commissioner in our service occupies no such position; he is nothing but the agent of this Government living in London. He does not occupy in any sense or in any degree such a position as an ambassador in diplomatic service in the British Government holds."

Now, if he could have supported that position, he might have had some grounds for the subsequent argument which he offered to the House. But let us, at this part of our enquiry, ask, is that position of the Minister of Justice sound? What did we hear to-day? We heard from an authority which I think the hon. gentleman from Amherst (Mr. Dickey) will respect, no less an authority than the High Commissioner himself, a definition of his own powers and his own position. And what did he claim for himself? He was in no sense a civil servant, but he was, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) showed, quoting from Sir Charles' own speech, a diplomatist, and in a sense an ambassador. My hon. friend went on quoting the language of the High Commissioner in which he claimed to hold a high and responsible position, one in which he did not feel himself free to deal with disputes between parties; he stood in such a position to both parties that he could deal frankly and fairly with them both, and he felt that if he could not occupy that position, he would be unfit for the position of High Commissioner. Sir, I believe the High Commissioner properly and rightly conceived the responsibilities and duties of the office which he holds. If the authority of that gentleman is not sufficient to justify the statement I make that the position of High Commissioner is akin to that of a diplomatist in another country, I shall give the hon. gentleman another authority which I think he will respect. When that office was created in this country, we had a debate upon the subject, and the present leader of the Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) was asked to define the position which this officer would hold towards the respective parties in the State, and towards the Government of the country, and he laid it down then in language so clear that it could not be misunderstood, in language which has been understood ever since, that the gentleman who occupied that position for the time being was in the nature of a diplomatist, or an ambassador. The Prime Minister said:

"It is believed that by having an officer holding a quasi-diplomatic position, in fact holding a diplomatic position, so far as is consistent with our position as a dependency of the Empire—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let the hon. gentlemen cheer after I am through—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

—"his statements, and actions, and prestige will be generally accepted by the public, and will greatly assist in giving a direction to the emigration from the United Kingdom and from Europe generally."

He was to hold a position free from party and above party, a position so high above party that his statements, when made publicly, were to be accepted by the public at large as true statements; and the English public and the world were asked, on the statement of the First Minister of this country, to pay, not the respect that is paid to the voice or the statement of a politician, but they were asked to give that weight to the High Commissioner's statement, when made as High Commissioner, which should be attached to the statement of a man standing above and aloof from all parties. He went on to say:

"Therefore the Dominion, like the other Colonies of the Empire, has been, to a great degree, unrepresented; and it is of great importance, at the present juncture, to have in Europe a resident agent, or Minister, who will be on the spot for the purpose of being consulted upon any negotiations that are going on between Her Majesty's Government and the various European powers in commercial matters. Her Majesty's Government have, as will be seen by the papers laid before the House, assented to the proposition of Canada. They are willing to receive and to give proper position and prominence to such an officer. They will give him such a diplomatic position as is consistent, of course, with the subordinate position of Canada as a dependency of the Empire."

Further on he said:

"I would say, Sir, that I believe in all sincerity that it is not only a very important step, but that it is a very wise step that Canada should at once as a Dominion, as an auxiliary kingdom, if I may use the expression, have a resident Minister, representing our wishes, to receive instructions from us and take at once a position among the *corps diplomatique*, which has not latterly been accorded to any portion of Her Majesty's Empire."

What is the difference between a resident minister at the Court of St. James and an ambassador? I do not catch what an hon. gentleman opposite says, but, perhaps, he will explain the difference if he knows it. We have here the declaration of the First Minister defining the duties of the office. We have the statement that the occupant was to be above political party contentions, and that he was to occupy a position that would ensure for any statement made by him in England the most ample belief and confidence, and the opinion was expressed that he would be one of the *corps diplomatique* and the representative of an auxiliary kingdom at the Court of St. James. If that is so, what is the meaning of the language which the Minister of Justice found himself driven to use, that Sir Charles Tupper occupied no such position, but was merely a civil servant. We start, therefore, with this proposition, that on the evidence of the First Minister who proposed the establishment of the office, and on the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper, who fills the office, his position is not one akin to that of a deputy minister or a civil servant, but is one above and beyond such position and akin to that of a diplomatist. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to produce a precedent in history where a diplomatist accredited to a foreign country engaged in political warfare against one of the parties of that country and continued to hold his position. We remember the false step taken by a former Minister who represented Great Britain in Washington. He wrote a letter, not a very strong letter, in which he expressed a slight preference for the policy of one of the political parties. Few hours elapsed before he was obliged to leave his position,

after the fact that he had written the letter was made public. He had to leave Washington and lose his position, and he has regained neither his position nor his prestige.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper did not interfere in English politics.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) It does not matter whether he interfered in English politics or not; but I will show how he interfered in English politics. He attempted to lead the English people into the belief that half the Canadian people were traitors. He basely took advantage of the position which he held to decry the Canadian people to the English people to whom he was accredited. That being the position of Sir Charles Tupper, the question is whether hon. members should attempt to justify his conduct or language during the late elections. It is said that we should not blame Sir Charles Tupper, but the Government. If the High Commissioner so far forgets the dignity and respect which he owes to his position and steps down into the turmoil of political life, and becomes a public calumniator, he should not escape the condemnation of Parliament. I understood the hon. gentleman who preceded me to intimate that this House of Commons is not the tribunal to pass judgment on an officer who mistakes and abuses his position. There is not a tribunal in the Dominion of Canada so competent to pass judgment upon an officer holding the position which Sir Charles Tupper occupies as is this tribunal which represents the people. For what purpose are we here? To maintain our own dignity and self respect.

Mr. DICKEY. I was quoting Todd's Parliamentary Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I do not know from whom the hon. gentleman was quoting. The hon. gentleman never could get the authority of Mr. Todd for such a position. I will undertake to sit down if the hon. gentleman can quote from Mr. Todd a case in which a diplomatist abused his position by using such language as Sir Charles Tupper used and acted as he acted, and the House of Commons was held not to be the proper tribunal in which to bring him to book for that offence. Having established, as I have satisfactorily established, that position, what is the next point to be considered? It is that the High Commissioner, occupying that elevated, diplomatic position, made use of language towards one of the parties of the State, which the resolution characterizes as involving a breach of the duties of the office which the High Commissioner fills. Did he do so? It is a question of fact. How does the Minister of Justice meet the charge? By the statement that no evidence had been offered in support of the allegation contained in the resolution. My hon. friend and leader who moved the resolution thought that at least this House would be entitled to use knowledge which is common to us all. He thought it was common knowledge that Sir Charles Tupper was High Commissioner, and that he came to this country. Then we had the statement of the First Minister that Sir Charles Tupper came here to interfere in the elections, and that he spoke in favour of one of the political parties. Moreover, the press during three months teemed with his speeches abusing the Liberal party and the Grand Trunk Railway. Since the return of the High Commissioner to England he has not failed to vilify,

abuse and traduce that great corporation to which Canada owes so much, the Grand Trunk Railway. The High Commissioner did not satisfy his spleen with the speeches he made in this country, but since returning to England he has done his worst to abuse the management of the road, and to diminish, if he could, the value of the shares of that great corporation in the English market. I do not think he has been successful; his statements have been discounted because he has become known. But that does not excuse him, because he did his worst in that matter. The Minister of Justice said that no evidence had been offered up to the time he spoke in support of the charges in the resolution, ignoring the fact that a two days' debate had occurred in which evidence was submitted without stint in support of the resolution. I heard the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Dickey) say that no evidence had been furnished in support of the proposition that the High Commissioner had vilified one of the great parties of the country, and had accused them of treason. Of all the representatives in this House, that hon. gentleman should have been the last man to make such a statement, because he came from the county, and the very county town in which the slander was uttered. I hold in my hands the *Amherst Gazette*, and I do not desire to quote from it, for the echoes of its language have barely died away; and yet the hon. gentleman does not remember that such language was uttered. What did Sir Charles Tupper say in the course of his carefully prepared and revised speech, a speech uttered in cold blood on declaration day, when the heat of the election was over? Speaking of one of the great parties of this country he said: "There are two great parties in Canada, one loyal to the mother country, the other alien thereto and turning its back on Great Britain." Did the hon. gentleman ever hear that language uttered? He may believe it to be true or false, but he must not deny that it was uttered by Sir Charles, and was a disgrace to the High Commissioner in view of the position he occupies. It was open to Sir Charles to throw up his position and declare that the issue between the two great parties was so important he would resign, and as a private citizen take part in the struggle. If he had resigned the emoluments of his office and the prestige attaching to the position he held, and, standing on a common level with other electors, have chosen to vilify, blackguard and abuse his opponents, he would have been met in proper fashion. But for the High Commissioner—whose words the First Minister says from his very position will be accepted by all parties in the Empire as true—to stand upon a public platform and charge that which he must know to be false, namely, that one of the great parties in this State was prepared to hand over the country to aliens, is a charge that cannot go unchallenged, a charge which is false in itself, and a charge which I do not think there are twenty gentlemen on the Government benches believe in. Under the circumstances, and considering the position which Sir Charles Tupper held at the time, I not only characterize the charge as false but the man who made it as acting indecently when he made it. More than that: Sir Charles Tupper was not satisfied with blackguarding and vilifying one of the great parties in the State, but he must needs vilify one of the greatest corporations in this

country. The hon. gentleman attempted to make the House believe that there was no charge against the Grand Trunk Railway, but that it was all against Cartwright, Wiman, and Farrer. Is that true? Are we to shut our eyes to the record? Are we to believe what Sir Charles Tupper's own newspaper says he spoke on the occasion to which I refer? According to his own paper he said:

"When this election came on, notwithstanding all we had done for this company, it issued a circular commanding its thousands of employes to vote against the Government. He never could have believed that a company of English shareholders could be induced to use its great power and influence to strike down British institutions in this country."

Is that a charge against the Grand Trunk Railway or is it not? Is it not a charge that the Grand Trunk Railway was conspiring with these treason-mongers to whom Sir Charles Tupper previously referred. He goes on to say:

"The Grand Trunk Railway also, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been ruining its own shareholders in its vain attempts to try to obstruct that line and going into wild purchases of lines to embarrass it."

What could be more calculated to injure the interests of that great corporation than this language of Sir Charles Tupper, which was telegraphed to England and put into the hands of every shareholder of the Grand Trunk Railway, with the malicious purpose, I contend, of damaging the interests of that corporation, so far as any statement made by Sir Charles Tupper could damage those interests. I maintain that if there is a corporation in Canada which it is our interest to speak respectfully of, it is the Grand Trunk Railway. Why, you cannot float any great financial scheme for the country without that scheme being referred to those in that company who have great influence at home, and if you attempt to destroy the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, just to that extent do you damage and destroy the interests of this great country. Sir Charles Tupper is not satisfied with denouncing the whole Liberal party as traitors, but he must single out for his abuse the leader of the Liberal party, the leader whom we are proud of, the leader whose policy we believe in, and advocated and supported at the polls, the leader whose policy only, we believe, can bring prosperity to this country: he singles that leader out and without a shadow of evidence to justify the vile charge he classes him with traitors and treason-mongers. Sir Charles Tupper says:

"Now you find Laurier, Wiman, Farrer, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, these craven creatures who have been representing us as people whose life could be crushed out by the United States, leading and abetting a party which turns its back on England."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman who said "hear, hear," cannot mean it. He surely does not mean to characterize the leader of the Liberal party as a coward, he is too much of a gentleman and he has sat too long with the Hon. Mr. Laurier in this House to do so. He knows that there is no man in this Parliament of Canada less open to the foul charge, than the eloquent, the able and single-minded leader of the Liberal party. I denounce the language used by Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion not only towards the party as a whole, but towards its trusted leader, as unworthy of any man holding a position in the Civil Service, let alone a man holding the exalted

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

position of High Commissioner. The hon. Minister of Justice asks his friends to vote down this resolution. Does he himself justify the use of that language, dare he rise in his place as a respected member of this House, and one for whom I have the highest respect, and say he will take the responsibility of endorsing that foul calumny? No, Sir, he will not, nor do I believe that there are ten men on that side of the House who will do it. While that language stands there uncontradicted, published in Sir Charles Tupper's own organ, circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country, telegraphed to England for the wicked purpose of injuring the Grand Trunk Railway and the Liberal party, we are not only within our rights in asking the House to condemn him, but I believe there are numbers of gentlemen on the other side of the House who if they do not condemn him by their votes will condemn him in their hearts. The hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) places in my hands the *Morning Chronicle* of Quebec in which the very same foul charge is repeated from the very same foul lips, and yet in the face of these charges, and in the face of this evidence which is overwhelming, we have an honoured and respected gentleman of this House, who perhaps did not hear it across the floor, denying that such charges were ever made at all, and calling on his friends to white-wash Sir Charles Tupper because he said there was no evidence: when the evidence is overwhelming. I will be prepared to submit it to the hon. gentleman himself as a lawyer and ask him can he give any other verdict than guilty? The hon. gentleman, who is Minister of Marine and Fisheries came forward in a very gallant attempt to do that which his colleagues shrank from doing, and one cannot but sympathize largely with the Minister of Marine in his gallant attempt. He was standing up for an absent father, and the sympathy of the House went out in a large measure to him, but it must be painful to him to find that these men whom it is said Sir Charles Tupper put in their places, these men supporting the party which it is said he returned to power, remained mute and silent and left it for his own son to defend the High Commissioner. We have it stated to-night that whatever apology or excuse can be offered for any other living man no apology can be offered for Mr. Wiman, because he is an "admitted traitor and scoundrel." That is what he was called to-night. I do not know Mr. Wiman, I never saw the gentleman in my life. I never had any communication with him, but he may be, as I believe him to be, a very clever man. I heard Mr. Wiman's character once described in this House, not by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but by no less a personage than the High Commissioner, when he held the position of Finance Minister in the Government. My recollection does not enable me to say that upon that occasion Sir Charles Tupper called Mr. Wiman an "admitted traitor." I rather think that upon that occasion, and it is only a few years ago, the High Commissioner eulogized Mr. Wiman as a gentleman entitled to the gratitude of the Canadian people, as the personal friend of the then Finance Minister, the man who had invited him to approach Mr. Bayard when he offered unrestricted reciprocity to the United States; and, Sir, the thanks that Mr. Wiman, the friend of the then Finance Minister, gets for paving the way and smoothing the difficulties between this country and the United States,

are the denunciations of him as an admitted traitor which we have heard to-night by the hon. Minister of Marine. Is this an indication of what the policy of the Government is to be? Is the language we have heard to-night likely to favour and assist the negotiations which we are told are to take place next October at Washington on the subject of reciprocity? Sir, I think the people of this country have a right to charge, against some of the Ministers at least, that they have not been wise, that they have not kept a proper control over their tongues, that they have forgotten the responsibility of their position, that they have made use of language which will rise up before this country when in the persons of her representatives she appears at Washington to negotiate a fair treaty of reciprocity.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to see that the proposal to adjourn the debate is received in the spirit which is apparent. It is now a quarter to twelve o'clock, and I would say to the hon. gentleman who leads the House that four or five hon. members on this side of the House yet intend to speak on this question, so it is not possible to close the debate to-night, unless we continue to sit through the small hours, till four or five o'clock in the morning.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. LAURIER. It can go ahead, and if hon. gentlemen want to have that kind of game, they know that it does not always have the result it is supposed to have. I do not want to enter into that game, and I hope the hon. leader of the House will understand that the proposition is a perfectly reasonable one. We have been endeavouring to carry on the business of the House by mutual agreement on fair terms. If we are to cease to have that, let us know it at once.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman who has just proposed the adjournment of the debate sent a note across to me about half-past ten asking whether an adjournment, if proposed, would be acceptable to our side of the House. I consulted with my friends, and the decision was that we would prefer to go on with the debate and finish it to-night. That was stated plainly to the hon. gentleman. He told me there were several other members who wanted to speak. I said that of course they could speak, as it was not yet late. Now, this is the second or the third night of this debate, and unless we sit to a later hour we cannot finish our work. There is a large attendance of members this evening; let us finish this debate. I have no doubt that hon. members will not make long speeches now after the full discussion we have had.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remind the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that no opposition at all was offered to a very early closing on the first day of this debate, and the courtesy then extended by my hon. friend without the slightest reluctance on his part ought in all common reason to be extended to us now. In fact, as the hon. gentleman knows nothing is to be gained in promoting public business by refusing reasonable concessions; and he knows that a very large number of the members of this House have to

be present at a moderately early hour to-morrow morning at a very important investigation. Practically most of the members of this House have been at work from ten o'clock this morning till nearly twelve o'clock to-night, and it is not reasonable that men should be kept at work from twelve to fourteen hours a day. We do not want to engage in any filibustering tactics; but I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if it is their disposition to refuse reasonable concessions, they will have to be met in the same spirit, and it will not be convenient for them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this proposition is a reasonable one. Many of us sat in the committee this morning from half-past ten till one o'clock, and we have been sitting here till about midnight, and it is unfair to ask us to go on longer to-night with this discussion. It is desirable that business should be conducted in a way acceptable to both sides of the House. There are a great many members in this House, as there are a great many people in the country, who are very much opposed to the speeches and statements that have been made by the High Commissioner, and it is just as well that the subject should be threshed out in this discussion.

Mr. TISDALE. My principal reason for objecting to the motion for adjournment is this: that the ordinary courtesy, which I understand usually exists between political parties, to accommodate members who are called away by important private business, has been refused to us. If that sort of thing is to continue, I am prepared to sit night and day to get through the business, in order to have an opportunity to attend to matters of a personal nature which are only second in importance to my duties as a member of this House. While I am satisfied of the sincerity and force of the demand of hon. gentlemen opposite that we should not be detained here too long, still I should like to have a better understanding on both sides.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that upon the first night of this debate he asked me to consent to an adjournment at an early hour, under an expectation which luckily has not been verified up to this moment, but which, unfortunately, may be at any moment; and I think it would not be advisable, under the circumstances, that we should engage in a wrangle which would be most unseemly.

Mr. BOWELL. Under the circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman should consider a matter of this kind a matter of courtesy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say it is a matter of courtesy.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a matter of agreement. It would have been brutality in the one case, as it is ungentlemanliness in the other.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to see the Government unwilling to accede to the request of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I may tell them that soon, perhaps, they will be only too glad to have the leader of the Opposition concur in their wishes. During the present debate, personal accusations have been made against the hon. leader of the Opposition. We, the French members, in order not to take the time of the House, have been so good natured

as not to take the floor; but if, with the half of members and strength, a sort of tyranny is to be resorted to, then we will demand our rights and those of our chief, and may take the time required to lay stress upon the arguments we may think necessary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that there are several gentlemen on that side of the house who wish to take part in the debate.

Mr. LAURIER. That is so.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say that on our side of the House the feeling is that we should not adjourn, and the reason which made me ask for an adjournment the other day was one that struck the House at once as a very good and strong reason.

Mr. LAURIER. Certainly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid if we continue the debate after the bulletin I have just received, we may find ourselves in the midst of it when the event we all dreaded the other night may occur. Under these circumstances, I will consent to the adjournment, but I may ask the hon. gentleman when he expects we may finish the debate?

Mr. LAURIER. That will be altogether at the discretion of the Government, and I promise we will finish it at the next sitting.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have just received a bulletin signed by the three medical men. It reads as follows:—

“The Premier passed a quiet day without notable change since seven o'clock this evening. Since that time he has shown signs of great prostration, evidenced by perspiration and a laboured respiration, numbering 30 per minute; pulse 135, weak and irregular; took usual nourishment at nine o'clock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PAYMASTER OF MILITARY DISTRICTS Nos. 5 AND 6.

Mr. LÉPINE (translation) asked, Who is the officer temporarily acting as paymaster of Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6? Has the said officer furnished security? Has he always discharged the duties of the office to the satisfaction of the Government? How much has he been paid for his services during the past twelve months? Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a permanent paymaster, or to retain without security a temporary officer in that important position?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that the officer temporarily acting as paymaster of

Mr. AMYOT.

Military Districts Nos. 5 and 6 is Lt.-Col. D'Orsonnens, the commanding officer of District No. 7. This officer has only been appointed temporarily, and, as temporary officer, has not been required to furnish security. He has discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the Government. He has not been paid anything extra for the services which he now performs. The question of the appointment of a permanent paymaster is still under consideration.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER—WHARFAGE DUES.

Mr. PERRY asked, Whether the Department of Marine and Fisheries has obtained from the wharfinger at Tignish Breakwater, Prince Edward Island, a return showing the amount of wharfage collected during the year 1890? If so, what is the amount? If not, will the department order a return to be sent in? And how soon?

Mr. TUPPER. On the 15th December last the usual circular was sent to the wharfinger at Tignish, asking for his return showing the amount of wharfage collected during the year. The return not having reached the department, the wharfinger was instructed on the 21st May to send in his return, and the agent at Charlottetown has also been asked to report on the neglect of the wharfinger to forward his returns.

BEAVERTON DOCK.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, What is the name and post office address of each party who tendered for the Beaverton Dock? What was the amount of each tender? Who received the contract? Have the plans or specifications been changed since the contract was let? If so, what is the nature of the change, and what additional cost will it entail?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will give the names of the parties who tendered, consecutively. They were as follows:—Patrick Navin, Lindsay, Ont., \$12,400; George J. Wilson, Ottawa, Ont., \$11,400; John Stewart, Ottawa, Ont., \$14,800; Richard Tobin & J. C. O'Keefe, Ottawa, Ont. (together), \$12,500; Henry Smith & John Heney, Ottawa (together), \$9,917; H. Watters, Lindsay, Ont., \$9,832; Robert Grant & Co., Toronto, \$9,603; Charles Wynn, Peterborough, Ont., \$8,300; Thomas Treleaver, Beaverton, Ont., \$11,775; David Porter, Wiarton, Ont., \$7,500; A. J. Belcher, Peterborough, and E. Thomson, Burleigh Falls (together), \$10,570; John Burns, York, Ont., \$11,490. The party who received the contract was David Porter, of Wiarton, the amount of his tender, \$7,500, being the lowest. The hon. gentleman asks if the plans or specifications have been changed since the contract was let. Yes; the change has been caused by the construction of a block to fill in between the two outer blocks of the wharf, for the purpose of giving additional strength to the work at that point and the better shelter of vessels, and also an additional length of 50 feet of stone embankment required to place the outer end of the wharf in the depth of water stipulated in the contract. The additional cost is \$830, which, with the amount of the contract, makes a total of \$8,330.