

they get 10 per cent of the subsidy," he asked, "what will that amount to?" But he said, "Return the Reform party to power, and we will do away with this boodling and corruption, and these big steals from the country." I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he remembers what took place in the province of Quebec before the last general election, in connection with the Baie des Chaleurs railway scheme? And has he any remembrance of what was revealed when the purists who handled the money in that transaction were brought before the courts? Has he any remembrance that \$15,000 of that money was taken to retire three notes made by E. Pacaud and endorsed by Mercier, the two Langeliers and Senator Pelletier, one of these being a gentleman who occupies a seat in this House? Has he any remembrance that \$8,000 was taken to retire two notes made by E. Pacaud and endorsed by Mercier, C. Langelier, Pelletier, and the honourable and immaculate Tarte? Has he any remembrance that \$6,788 was taken for payments made to Mercier, or that \$9,391 was taken for "ditto" to C. Langelier? Has he any remembrance that \$1,582 was taken for payments to members of the legislature who were not members of the Cabinet? Has he any remembrance of the \$2,000 that were used to take up Mr. Tarte's note, which was endorsed by the Hon. Mr. Langelier? Has he any remembrance of the \$27,900 that went to Pacaud for personal expenses? But, of course, this is all purity; no corruption in all this. Has he any recollection of the \$24,456 that was passed over into Mr. Pacaud's hands? or the \$25,000 that went to Mr. Geoffrion? Or the \$24,500 that went to the credit of Mr. Pacaud in connection with another deal? No, he has not any recollection of these, and, of course, everything is going to be pure if the people will only return them to power. In connection with that election, there is a great deal to come out. The hon. gentleman said that members supporting the Government talked a great deal about their loyalty, and ran their last election on loyalty and attributed to the Opposition disloyal motives. I have here an extract taken from a Buffalo paper which discloses some information, but which shows, to my mind, that there is a great deal more behind which the Canadian people ought to know. The people ought to know where hon. gentlemen opposite got their money, for although they got some from the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and other schemes, we believe and are credibly informed that they got a large portion from the United States. How did they get it? Because they were allied to men over there whose sole aim and object was the annexation of Canada, and who, in order to accomplish that, were prepared to dive deep into their own pockets and pay out money freely to the Canadian Reform party. Let me read

Mr. SPROULE.

this despatch from Washington to a Buffalo paper, dated 1st May, 1895:

Washington, D.C., May 1.—Special to the Buffalo "Commercial":—Behind the late resolution of the New York Legislature in favour of the annexation of Canada, was this interesting story, the material facts of which are as follows:—In the fall of 1893 a French Liberal member of the Canadian Parliament, accredited by ex-Premier Mercier of Quebec, and accompanied by a delegation of other Canadian politicians, came to New York to see if a campaign fund could not be raised there to put the question of annexation, as they said, fairly before the Canadian rural constituencies. The business embarrassments of Mr. Ras Wiman, who had heretofore financed the annexation propaganda—

What does that mean?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a shame that this should be lost, and I would advise the hon. gentleman to wait until the representatives of the Conservative press come back to their places in the gallery.

Mr. SPROULE. We will have a sufficient record to supply the hon. gentleman and the press and the country, whether the members of the Conservative press are here or not:

—the business embarrassments of Mr. Ras Wiman, who had heretofore financed the annexationist propaganda, was the assigned reason for seeking broader and more direct relations with American friends of Canadian annexation. The delegation was successful in enlisting the support of Messrs. Charles A. Dana and Andrew Carnegie, who brought in so many other adherents that, as the result of a series of conferences, the delegation went home with the assurance that \$50,000 should be immediately supplied to put the movement on its feet, and afterwards as much more as might be needed to keep it in successful operation. After the departure of the French Liberal and his compatriots, Mr. Carnegie, who had agreed to look after the financial end of the international alliance, concluded he would make some independent and confidential inquiries in Canada to ascertain if Messrs. Mercier and company might be trusted with the disbursement of the annexation fund, and whether their political influence was sufficient to put the question of annexation effectively before the Canadian electorate. He was informed in reply that Hon. Wilfred Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party, who was the only politician who could give the question a practical standing, positively refused to openly adopt annexation as a part of the Liberal platform.—

He would not openly adopt it. What are we to assume from that? Evidently we must assume that he would scarcely adopt it. Yet these hon. gentlemen talk loyalty, and boasted of the great loyalty on that side of the House:

—positively refused to openly adopt annexation as a part of the Liberal platform, though favourable to closer and friendlier relations with the United States, and to a continental policy in all matters short of actual political union.

He would go the whole length; he would do away with the whole tariff to satisfy the