

check, touching the amount of grain that can be transported by the water stretches in 66½ years. All I can say is he must have been thinking of the period which must elapse before the smallest fragment of his \$71,000,000 would be realised by the people of this country. I observe also that the hon. gentleman, and perhaps with some reason, alluded, not at very great length, but still rather pointedly, to the result of certain bye-elections which had taken place. I think that, considering the hon. gentleman has beside him two colleagues, at least, who have shared the fate of war, he might have considered their feelings before calling their attention to the results which sometimes flow from the indiscreet actions of agents and others engaged in elections. In the hon. gentleman's own case I observe that very recently—I suppose I will be pardoned for referring to what took place in the recess—he congratulates himself and his hearers, with good cause, on the fact that this time, at any rate, he was not found guilty of corrupt practices. Practice makes perfect. The hon. gentleman was caught twice, but I am bound to say that he was not caught for the third time. No doubt the hon. gentleman on that occasion was pardonably proud of the victory he had achieved. It was, no doubt, a remarkable one. Here is the hon. gentleman—whose constituent, by the by, I am, and I hope he will remember that fact if I have any application to make to him—here is the hon. gentleman, the Premier of the Dominion, with the power, the prestige, the influence of the position of Premier, returned to a seat which he had represented by great majorities for twenty-five or thirty years—he will correct me if I am wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good long time at any rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, the Premier of Canada, succeeds in defeating an absent man by a majority of 12 in that constituency, which, six weeks before, had returned a friendly supporter of the hon. gentleman to the Local House by a majority of 180. It was a great victory, and he has very good ground to be very proud of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another reason why he should be proud of it. I, as I say, am a constituent of the hon. gentleman. I know something of the position of parties in the city of Kingston, and I notice a remarkable thing. There were about one hundred non-residents in Kingston. These are generally pretty well divided between the two parties and there is not much difficulty in knowing, as we are all aware, their opinion; and it must have been a comfort to the hon. gentleman to know that he owes his return to the fact that, while only ten of those non-residents voted for his opponent, fifty-one came from the ends of the earth to vote for him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the hon. gentleman is quite right. It is a feather in his cap here. We had these men, we had these poor men, we had these men to whom days' wages were matters of great importance, these men to whom the price of a railway ticket there and back was of great importance; we had these men coming, I am told, from Texas, from Port Arthur, from Watertown, in the State of New York, from Rochester, from Chicago, from east and from west, from north and from south, all spurred by a noble ambition to sacrifice their time and their money and to vote for the hon. gentleman. There are few of us who could attract so much enthusiasm, and it was interesting to see how this hon. gentleman's friends acted in the role of good Samaritans, how they met these poor strangers at the railway stations, drove them to the polls, fed and lodged them, and, in accordance with scriptural precedent, lent them twopence, which I see by the record

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

means \$15 of Canadian currency, to pay their way. So the hon. gentleman is quite justified in demanding our congratulations, which I freely tender to him, on the marvellous victory he achieved on that occasion. Now, I have heard that the hon. gentleman is a changed man. I sincerely trust that is so, and I sincerely trust that, in regard to these several measures for the improvement of our Election Act, and for the improvement of the trial of controverted elections and other things which are promised us here, we are going at length and at last to have some substantial tokens of the right hon. gentleman's penitence; I trust that he will at once do away with the Gerrymander Act, even if he will not abolish the Franchise Bill. I am very sorry—I am afraid it is an instance of back-sliding on the part of the hon. gentleman—that he cannot see his way to deprive himself of the means which he has taken in certain counties, and notably the County of Queen's, N. B., to promote perfect impartiality in the returning officers by allowing the candidate supporting the Ministry of the day to select his own returning officer and his deputy returning officers too. The hon. gentleman dwelt at length on the power which was vested in those pernicious Local Governments, who do not seem, by the way, to share that confidence in the hon. gentleman which, he says, the people of Canada seem to entertain, to select permanent officers to discharge these duties. But my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) did not say anything about officers in the employment of the Local Governments. The right hon. gentleman chose, for his own purposes, to add to what my hon. friend said on that subject. What we ask is that we should have returning officers, and deputy returning officers, in whose action both sides could have some reasonable amount of confidence. The right hon. gentleman says that no complaints have been made as to the action of returning officers, but, while that may be true, it has been in the power of the candidate to nominate a score of deputy returning officers who are not likely to be over-scrupulous, as has been shown on several occasions, in the way in which they will promote the return of their patron for the time being. I agree with the right hon. gentleman in part that this is not a fit time, in fact that it is not possible for us now, to discuss the details of the Fishery Treaty, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman is entitled on that ground to expect that no attention should be called to the patent and apparent fact that, whatever may be said as to the merits of that treaty in itself, that treaty is hopelessly, utterly inconsistent with the position which was taken one bare year ago by the hon. gentleman himself, according to the Minutes brought down to us in the blue book which I have here in my desk; nor is he entitled to say that we are going out of the record when we call attention to the fact, whatever may be the merits or demerits of the question, that this treaty, as far as we are advised, has not settled anything. The hon. gentleman and his friends contended, no doubt with great force, for many things which they and we have always agreed were the real and absolute property of the people of Canada, and I can see on the face of it no sort of recognition of the things for which the hon. gentleman contended. I say that either the hon. gentlemen were most grossly in the wrong before, if this treaty be an honorable and satisfactory settlement; or, if they were right before, then I wonder how they, after having His Excellency's signature to these several Minutes which I have alluded to, can come down to us and venture to hope that the House will consider this an honorable and satisfactory settlement. Let them take their choice. One of two things has occurred: either they have most needlessly run frightful risks, have subjected this country to needless humiliation, or, failing that, it will be excessively difficult for them to explain why we should accept this as a just settlement of the claims which Canada has preferred. Nevertheless, in answer to the hon. gentleman's appeal, I do not propose to go further on that