

to a division is that they have no confidence in the statements of the right hon. leader of the House. That is just the whole truth of the matter. If they had the confidence in him that I believe the country possesses, they would not press this motion to a division, or ask for papers. The leader of the Opposition draws a comparison between the tenders for this railroad, and those for any other public work. There is one great difference however. When an advertisement is inserted in Dominion newspapers, calling for tenders for a public work, tenders are submitted in answer to it, and then we can all understand they are public property. But in this case no advertisement was put in. Strangers came here from Europe and the United States—not our own citizens—and said: We will offer to do this work.

Mr. BLAKE. Do you know that?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No more than I am told by the leader of the House. Strangers came here and made an offer, and when a counter-proposition was made, they said, we will make this offer, and if not accepted, will withdraw it. I think it would not be fair to these gentlemen to bring down their propositions unless they had been told at the time such would be done, or unless their offer was in answer to an advertisement calling for tenders for such a great public work. I am quite satisfied with the statement that it would be a breach of confidence if those papers were brought down, and am quite prepared to vote confidence in it.

Mr. LAURIER. It is the basis of all free government that the acts of the Administration should be judged by the representatives of the people. In this case the same rule, it must be conceded, should apply. It is a well known principle that the people have a right to judge, not only of the honesty of those entrusted with the management of their affairs, but even of their judgment in action. The people have a right to say they have erred in judgment. How are we to deal with or decide this question, or whether the Government have accepted the best offer? It is impossible for the country to say, we have only the word of the Government. I am quite disposed to take the word of the Government as an individual, but not as a member of the House. As representatives of the people, I think every one of us has a right to say the acts of the Government should be done in broad daylight, so that every elector may have an opportunity of judging whether or not the Government and every individual member was right not only in motive but in judgment. This is the reason of the motion, and I think it will be the duty of every member to affirm its principle, that nothing should be concealed from the representatives of the people.

House divided. Motion negatived. Yeas, 52; nays, 112.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Anglin,	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Bain,	Gillies,	Olivier,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Borden,	Glen,	Pickard,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee (St. John),	Haddow,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Holton,	Rogers,
Cameron (Huron),	Huntington,	Ross (Middlesex),
Cartwright,	Killam,	Rymal,
Casey,	King,	Skinner,
Casgrain,	LaRue,	Smith,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Snowball,
Cockburn (Muskoka),	Macdonell (Lanark),	Thompson (Haldimand),
Coupal,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Dumont,	McDougall,	Weldon,
Fiset,	McIsaac,	Wheler,
Fleming,	Malouin,	Wiser.—52.
Flynn,		

NAYS:
Messieurs

Bannerman,	Girouard (Kent),	Montplaisir,
Beatty,	Grandbois,	Mousseau,

Beauchesne,	Hay,	Muttart,
Benoit,	Hesson,	Orton,
Bergeron,	Hooper,	Patterson (Essex),
Bill,	Houde,	Perrault,
Bolduc,	Ives,	Pinsonneault,
Boulthée,	Jackson,	Platt,
Bowell,	Jones,	Plumb,
Brecken,	Kaulbach,	Pope (Compton),
Brooks,	Keeler,	Pope (Queens),
Bunting,	Kilvert,	Poupore,
Carling,	Kirkpatrick,	Richey,
Caron,	Kranz,	Rochester,
Cimon,	Landry,	Ross (Dundas),
Colby,	Lane,	Rouleau,
Connell,	Langevin,	Routhier,
Costigan,	Lantier,	Royal,
Coughlin,	Little,	Ryan (Montreal),
Coursol,	Longley,	Rykert,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Shaw,
Daly,	McDonald (Cape Breton),	Sproule,
Daoust,	McDonald (Pictou),	Strange,
Dawson,	McDonald (Victoria, N.S.),	Tasse,
DeCosmos,	Macmillan,	Tellier,
Desaulniers,	McCallum,	Tilley,
Desjardins,	McQuaig,	Tupper,
Domville,	McGreevy,	Vallee,
Doull,	McKay,	Vanasse,
Drew,	McLennan,	Wade,
Dugas,	McLeod,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Elliott,	McQuade,	Wallace (York),
Farrow,	McRory,	White (Cardwell),
Fitzsimmons,	Manson,	White (Hastings),
Fortin,	Massue,	White (Renfrew),
Fulton,	Merner,	Williams,
Gault,	Method,	Wright.—112.
Gigault,	Mongenais,	

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, and to ask your ruling. Attention was called to the hon. the Minister of Railways quoting documents not before the House. He persisted, however, in referring to those documents, and by that reference he was able to inform the House, from his personal knowledge, that the best offer received by the Government, for constructing the Pacific Railway, was before the House. Now, according to the Rules of Debate in our own House, no Minister of the Crown is at liberty to read or quote from any despatch or other State paper not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it on the Table. The hon. gentleman has made that reference, and he has succeeded, by it, in persuading a large number of the members of this House to vote against the motion that I submitted, for I cannot conceive it possible that, without some belief of that kind being instilled into their minds by the confidence they have in the hon. gentleman, such a vote could possibly have been obtained.

An Hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am in order; I am giving my reasons for making the motion. I am here as an aggrieved member of the House of Commons. I want your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is too late to raise the point of order now, but as the hon. gentleman has asked for my ruling, it is this: According to *May*, a Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from papers not before the House. I did not see that any hon. gentleman read or quoted from any document. Besides, I do not see any objection to a member referring in general terms to what is mentioned in the motion of the hon. member for Lambton, or characterising or qualifying some of his statements by referring generally to documents or papers asked for. I think the point of order is not well taken.

PROPOSED LINE TO SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. MACKENZIE, in moving for copies of all offers made to the Government for the construction of a line of railway from any part of the proposed Canada Pacific Railway line to Sault Ste. Marie, said: I have only to say that I have heard that some offers have been made, and I hope they are not made by parties who are in danger of failing, because, in