

but that grave consequences might flow from our opposition to it—that the true interests of the Dominion and Empire demanded our support of the Treaty. I do not know whether the hon. the First Minister, whose distinguished ability we all recognise, knew that the hon. member for Cumberland had made this statement. Now, is the House, after these explanations, prepared to approve of his charge, his calumnious attack on me? How could he know that if I had been a Commissioner, instead of Sir A. T. Galt, the Dominion would only have got \$500,000 instead of \$5,500,000 from the Americans? He speaks of it with the greatest confidence, and said he knew we would only have got half a million of dollars if I had been the Commissioner. The hon. member for Cumberland (Sir Charles Tupper) knew nothing of my services in connection with the Fishery Commission. Sir A. T. Galt, a credible witness, a gentleman to whom he has referred here in terms so eulogistic, and in which I entirely concur—he had an opportunity of knowing the value of my services, whether they were in reality worth anything or not. Had Mr. Ford, the British agent, an opportunity of knowing whether my services were of any value or not? I think he had. These are the two gentlemen I call as witnesses in contradiction of the statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland. It might be considered egotism on my part, under ordinary circumstances, to make reference to this matter, yet I feel, as a public man, I am justified in refuting these slanders, and in referring to gentlemen who know the falsity of the hon. gentleman's statements. Sir A. T. Galt, on the 24th November, 1877, the day after the Commission closed, in writing to Earl Derby, refers to my services in these terms:—

“In all the proceedings, Mr. Ford has been most ably supported by Mr. Albert J. Smith, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has constantly attended the Commission, as representing the Dominion Government, and of whom it is difficult for me to speak in fitting terms of appreciation.

“As Commissioner, I have had an opportunity of observing the great value of the services of these two gentlemen, and I most respectfully bring them under the notice of Her Majesty's Government.”

This is the testimony of Sir A. T. Galt.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.

The hon. gentleman may say that it is of no value, but I do not think that Sir A. T. Galt would make a statement like that unless he believed at all events that there was some foundation for it. Mr. Ford, in making his report to the Government, speaking of me, says:

“But placed, as it has been my good fortune to be during the past six months, in almost daily communication with him I cannot refrain from bringing to your Lordship's notice the great assistance he has rendered me in the discharge of my duties as British agent to the Halifax Commission. To his cordial co-operation in all matters affecting the interest of the two countries, and to his unceasing exertions in the promotion of our cause, I mainly ascribe the success that has attended the enquiry which has just been terminated, and which has been crowned by so gratifying a result.”

Now, there is the testimony of these two gentlemen. One, occupying the position I did, and feeling deeply my responsibility to the country, felt naturally a great anxiety in the success of this case, and I devoted the best talents I possessed to the furtherance of the interests of this country in that connection. I felt it extremely hard, considering that I never had any altercation with the hon. gentleman, that he should have made such a defamatory attack upon me. I felt called upon to advance this testimony here in refutation of the slanderous statements made by the hon. member for Cumberland. I would not be afraid to appeal to the hon. the Minister of Justice also. He was in Halifax during the whole time this enquiry took place. I would not be afraid to appeal to the hon. members from Halifax, who likewise know something of my services, in contradiction of the charge made by the hon. member for Cumberland, if it were necessary to do so. At Moncton, the hon. member for Cumberland told the people that he would look after their interests, and be their friend, and that I had been direlict in my duty to my constituents. It is well-known that Moncton is the great centre of the Intercolonial Railway system, where the machine shops are situated. But how did the hon. gentleman promote the interests of Moncton and the working-man. He dismissed hundreds of employes from the shops at that place. I may also state that the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals seemed to think that it was necessary for him to make