

right to do so—I wish to say something with respect to some remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Now, I do not hold it worth my while though the rules of the House would permit it, to follow that hon. gentleman. I am not going to contradict him, but I am going to expose him. In the hearing of the House a very short time ago, that hon. gentleman took upon himself to say that I had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler with regard to the coal duty. Now, I have here the veritable words used by that gentleman at the meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway shareholders on the 6th of October, in the city of London. We will see what Sir Henry Tyler did say with respect to this same coal duty :

“ There was also a considerable rise in the cost of materials, of labor and of fuel ; and I am sorry to say that this was very much in consequence of the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government. That policy makes everything which a poor man requires dearer for him to purchase, and in consequence of that policy he requires higher wages in order to be enabled to exist. I have repeatedly spoken in this room as to the duty which is placed upon fuel. I cannot conceive anything more unwise in a nation like Canada, that has to import a great part of its fuel, and wishes to encourage its manufactures and to encourage its railways, than to place a duty upon the article of coal.”

Does the House, the press, and the country, want any better evidence than the statement I have just read, that in no possible circumstance in which the Minister of Railways can be placed is he able to adhere to the facts of the case. There is a sample ; there is proof that he is not. Every gentleman heard him say I had misquoted Sir Henry Tyler. There are Sir Henry Tyler's own words in reply. I do not expect to see the hon. gentleman blush, but I think that his friends, followers and leaders will blush—not for the discredit in which he is involved, but for the inconceivable stupidity which has enabled me to make such an exposure of his error. I forgot to say that in that same document I found a quotation from the report of superintendent on fuel ; and the hon. gentleman used the passage showing he had seen the speech, had examined it in detail, and deliberately suppressed the portion to which I alluded. I quote from *Herepath's Railway News*, the best authority on all railway subjects. Now, I come to the question which the hon. gentleman alluded to, in regard to which he made some surprising assertions, which he dare not put in plainer language, as to the mode in which I administered these several loans I was charged with negotiating in England. With respect to the mode in which the loans were placed on the market, the course followed was this : in the first place, I adopted the mode pursued by Sir Alexander Galt, Sir Francis Hincks and Sir John Rose, one and all infinitely better authorities as to the wisdom of the course I adopted than the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Finance, and all their colleagues and supporters put together. As to the result it is perfectly well known, to the House and hon. gentlemen, that Sir Francis Hincks, at any rate, may be depended upon as an impartial judge in my case. It is known that I took grievous objection to his entering into the Ministry of the Department of the Interior, therefore I may appeal to the publicly expressed testimony of Sir Francis Hincks—a very good judge on those subjects—as to the manner in which I placed those loans on the market. I obtained as high a price as possible, and any gentleman who wishes to see Sir Francis Hincks statements can find them in detail in the *Journal of Commerce* for the last several years. I may remark that when I first went into the London market I found our Canadian securities at 5 per cent. I was the first man who succeeded in floating a loan at 4 per cent., and I rendered a considerable service to the public of Canada by so doing. But I say more : the hon. gentleman insinuates there was something mysterious about these loans—that there was some illicit advantage to some or other persons in regard to them. I tell him this—that every farthing of the money paid in or about those

loans passed, not through my hands, but through the hands of the financial agents of this country, Messrs. Glyn, Baring and Rose ; that if there was any unfair or illicit advantage to any one it was given by those gentlemen. And if the Minister of Railways, or any of his colleagues, asserts that I betrayed the interests of Canada in these matters, they will have to make the same humble apology to those gentlemen which they had to make to my friend the Hon. Donald A. Smith. The House has not forgotten the charges those hon. gentlemen hurled at the head of Mr. Smith, nor have they forgotten the look of the Minister of Railways when thirteen months ago I gave him the opportunity of retracting those slanders.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not retract anything.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I am not speaking of the Finance Minister ; I spoke of two other hon. gentlemen.

An hon. MEMBER. You said the Minister of Finance.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It was not the Minister, but other hon. gentlemen beside and around him. Now, as to the loans. The hon. gentleman attacks the prices at which my loans were sold in 1874 and 1876, and contrasts them with the prices obtained to-day, and he has the audacity to tell the people of the country and the members of this House that by some mysterious practices amounts of £600,000 sterling in one case and £300,000 or £400,000 in the other were put in the hands of some mysterious parties on the other side of the Atlantic. Let us contrast the loans made by the Finance Minister in 1879 and 1880. In 1879 he floated a loan of £3,500,000 which enjoyed the Imperial guarantee at 4 per cent. ; they were floated at an average of 96. For that loan he got something like £2,860,000 sterling. That loan to-day would be worth, at the current market quotations, not less than £3,250,000. Has the hon. Minister of Finance taken £400,000, by some mysterious means, out of the pockets of the people of this country, and put them into the pockets of the parties who negotiated the loan of 1879 ? I see the hon. Minister laugh, and well he may, at the profound ignorance displayed by his hon. colleague beside him. Now, Sir, when in 1880, I think it was, the hon. Minister floated another loan of £3,000,000 sterling, at 95 or thereabouts, are we to understand that because those securities now range at 105, the Minister of Finance, by some mysterious means, took £300,000 sterling, or say \$1,500,000 out of the pockets of the people, and put it into some private friend's pocket ? Sir, I have been in the habit during many years of listening to the hon. Minister of Railways, and I think he knows by this time how much value I attach to the tornado of words he occasionally lets loose in this chamber. It comes, and blows, and goes ; it has about as much effect on me as a hail storm is likely to have on a hill-top. Sir, before I dread the censure of that hon. gentleman and his colleagues, I must learn to respect them, and it is because of their past record that I neither dread their censure nor the utmost they can do.

Motion withdrawn by leave of the House.

Mr. ANGLIN. The long personal attack made by the hon. Minister of Railways upon the member for Centre Huron has, perhaps, served to distract the attention of the House from the question we have now under consideration. It is not my purpose to take any part in the contest between these two gentlemen. I feel that the hon. member for Centre Huron is abundantly able to take care of himself in matters of that kind, and I am quite willing to leave it to him to defend his reputation against the charges made by the hon. Minister of Railways. I think, on the whole, it would be better that we should address ourselves to the subject-matter before the House. If we were to accept the