

country and never having been in the eastern townships could not know the men he was recommending. I speak under correction; he may have known one or two, but I doubt if he knew any more. I doubt, if he knew, for instance, Dr. Pickel. When the recommendation came to Council from Lord Dundonald, it was known to every man in the Council that Lord Dundonald had taken his information second-hand, that he must have received from somebody recommendations as to these appointments. He tells us that he had got it from the gentlemen whom he had entrusted with the recruiting of the regiment. So far so good. But, if there was at the Council a gentleman who could say: I come from the part of the country where this regiment is to be recruited; I know the gentlemen whose names appear on the list, and I approve of all of them except one; this one, Dr. Pickel, in my estimation is not qualified for the position to which it is proposed to appoint him; he has never taken an interest in the militia and I assert that it is not right, it is not conducive to the best interest of the regiment and of the militia that this gentleman, who has no military qualification, should be put in such an important post as major:—if there were at the Council a gentleman able to speak such words with the authority of local knowledge, will any hon. gentleman on the other side say that it was an offence against the dignity of Lord Dundonald for the Council to be influenced by such representations? Will any hon. gentleman say that it was not, I will not say the right only, but the duty of that hon. gentleman to declare his honest convictions? Yet the head and front of the Minister of Agriculture's offending had this extent, no more.

### Downward Career of Conservatives.

Sir, I will not go into the minute, petty question whether or not my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, had the right to sign that document for the Minister of Militia. I see before me my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart); he is an old parliamentarian, and he knows that every day a colleague signs for a colleague and that the recommendation so signed goes before the Council and is dealt with by the Council. That ought to be a sufficient answer to such petty, miserable criticism. But, there is something more. Wonders will never cease,—the once proud Conservative party, in their downward career, have come to this—that yesterday we heard from one of the leaders of that party, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) a declaration that the General Officer Commander should be given *carte blanche*. The General Officer Commanding is appointed by this Government and occupies a subordinate position. But, according to the hon. gentleman he should be given *carte blanche* and whatever he does should be accepted; the minister and the cabinet should be simply recording clerks of his will. And this is the policy of the once great Conservative party. My reading of his story has informed me—and no doubt my hon. friend from Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Wm. Ross), who is an old veteran in the cause of reform, has the recollection that there was a time in Canada when we had militia authorities to govern us. Those were the old times of the Family Compact, when the military authorities were surrounded by a crowd of sycophants and minions, who could dispose of the public domain for their own benefit and that of their favorites. I do not know how the new doctrine will strike the whole province of Ontario. But if the names of Brown and Mackenzie have not been erased from the memory of the people there, I can imagine how the Grits of Ontario will receive it. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier went even further. Having stated that we should give *carte blanche* to the General Officer Commanding, he went on to the conclusion, which was inevitable from his premises, that we had acted very wrongly in relieving Lord Dundonald of his