

House with the importance of ascertaining whether he did really use the language attributed to him. Hon. gentlemen might, perhaps, be disposed to blame him for introducing this matter into the House, but he could point to a precedent from the English House of Commons. Sometime ago in England, a man named Johnson, holding office under the Imperial Government, made use on some public occasion of expressions which were calculated to give serious offence to a portion of the people of that country, and Mr. Sullivan, a member of the House of Commons, called the attention of the House to the fact that an official, in the pay of the Government, had abused his position, and asked the Government if any notice had been taken of it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said :

"As the House was aware, Mr. Johnston was a salaried official of the Crown, as a Commissioner of the Fishery Department, but Mr. Johnson had only recently been taken into the permanent Civil Service, and, perhaps, was not aware how objectionable it was for him to use the language attributed to him, holding the position he does. His right hon. friend the Chief Secretary had given Mr. Johnson a caution, which would probably be sufficient."

He thought hon. gentlemen would be satisfied that he was not out of place in rising on this occasion. The English Government had characterised Mr. Johnston's language as objectionable, and he thought the language of the hon. Judge he alluded to was still more objectionable. We had, in this country, all to look to our Judges with confidence, respect, and esteem. We wanted them to be above even the prejudices that sometimes influenced men belonging to different political parties, and we all wanted to feel that they were qualified and willing to dispense justice in an even-handed manner. When any Judge, no matter from what part of the country, gave evidence of what people believed to be a want of liberality in his public expressions, that was calculated to shake the confidence in such Judge of a portion of the people of this country who had to look for justice at his hands. He had no notion to make in reference to this matter. He felt confident, if the matter had not already been brought before the hon. the Minister of Justice, that that hon. gentleman would now deal with it

MR. COSTIGAN.

in such manner as he should deem it his duty to do. He (Mr. Costigan) now left the matter entirely in his hands, having performed what he deemed his duty to the public. He would just quote the exact words which the hon. Judge was reported as using. Several charges had been made against him in the newspapers, but he would refer to only one, in which he was stated to have said, at a meeting in Toronto of the Episcopalian Synod :

"He sincerely trusted that former differences ceasing to exist, they should become the pattern Diocese, and shoulder to shoulder fight the battles of the Church, and, with other Protestant denominations, go strongly against Popery and infidelity."

Mr. McDONALD (Pictou) : I have only one observation to make, in reply to the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., relating to a very high official in this country, Vice-Chancellor Blake. I have received a letter from a gentleman, calling my attention to some such observations, stated to have been made by that high dignitary, which I am ready to bring down, should any hon. member of the House require it. It was addressed to myself by, I think, a gentleman named Boyle. I have just another observation to make. I think my hon. friend will see that the high dignitary of whom he has just spoken, stands in a very different position from that of the official to whom he referred, Mr. Johnston. Vice-Chancellor Blake is a Judge of one of the Superior Courts of this country. He holds his position for life, or during good behaviour, and the Constitution provides that the only mode of impeaching or correcting the conduct of a Judge of the Superior Courts, is by an address of the two Houses of Parliament. It would be unbecoming and improper for me to say more.

WAYS AND MEANS.—THE TARIFF.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

House resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Tilley's proposed motion to agree to resolutions relative to duties of Customs and Excise, reported from Committee of Ways and Means (March 14th), and Mr. Mackenzie's motion in amendment thereto (April 4th).