

mitted to the House as a whole, and was accepted by the House as a whole. Was the House in that sincere or insincere? Did the First Minister intend at that time to assent apparently to this important work in order to secure the construction of works in which he himself took a more immediate interest? Did the House intend after they had accepted the policy of the Canal Commissioners as a whole, and after the country was irrevocably committed to that portion of the policy in which the hon. gentleman was more particularly interested, to take such a course as that now proposed? The late Government acting in good faith in this matter obtained the necessary information with regard to this work, and were on the very eve of asking for tenders, when at the instance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and gentlemen associated with him from New Brunswick, the Government consented to allow a dispute about the route to be submitted to a disinterested engineer and finally to the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department. He did not envy the position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on this question. That gentleman stood immediately and personally responsible for thus trifling with one of the great public works of this country. At his earnest appeal the late Government postponed asking for tenders, and placing the work under contract before Parliament met. Did the hon. gentleman delay the work then simply for the purpose of burking it altogether? The present Government when they came into power declared that their policy was, as it was of that of the late Government, to carry out the whole policy of the Canal Commissioners, which had been endorsed by Parliament. Not only that, but a sum of money was placed in the estimates for this work, and it was announced that tenders would be asked for. The hon. gentleman having adopted a policy calculated to invite the hostility of every interested section of the country, still found it was all insufficient to enable him with any prospect of success to have this work defeated by his own friends. The hon. member for South Bruce then came to the front with a statement the most immoral, politically, that had ever been made in this House, and objected to the Premier carrying out the policy which he had announced to the House, and sug-

gested the propriety of spending the money required for this work in some other way. The policy of the Government as announced in the first instance, was to invite tenders so as to ascertain the cost of the work, and whether that cost would be such as would warrant them in proceeding with it, but the hon. member for South Bruce was not willing to trust the Government of the day with such power, and accordingly indicated to them that they must change that policy. Not only did he do that, but he actually invited the Government to consider whether they could not discover some local or sectional objects upon which this money might be expended rather than on the Baie Verte Canal. What would be thought in Ontario if it was proposed to this House that instead of spending the money required for the enlargement of the Welland Canal it should be spent for sectional objects, and by this means secure the defeat of that project? Yet, the proposition of the hon. member for South Bruce was precisely similar. A more corrupt and immoral proposition was never proposed to Parliament. He was astonished that the First Minister of the Crown did not feel more what he owed to the high position he occupied, that he should recede from it and allow any gentleman, however important, able or influential, to dictate to the Treasury Benches of this country what the public policy should be. It was humiliating to see any Government driven to the position in which the hon. member for South Bruce had placed them. He left the responsibility of it to the Minister of Marine, and the Minister of Customs, but for whose interposition this great work, so vitally important to a large portion of New Brunswick, and so important to the trade and commerce of the country from one end to the other, would at this moment have been half constructed.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the Government accepted the responsibility. He never yet heard, in all the audacious speeches the hon. gentleman made, anything more audacious than the one to which the House had just listened. The hon. member presumed to lecture the Government on political morality and the maintenance of proper dignity. The hon. member had asserted it was a farce to bring down these estimates year after year. Who commenced it? The hon. gentleman with-