

a proposition ready, a most original one—he declared it in a speech delivered three days before the revised report appeared in the St. John "Telegraph." And what was this original idea? He said that, not being successful at once in getting a seat, he might go into the Senate for two or three months, and he had arranged with a friend in the Senate to loan him his seat for three months. And so this bright and shining light in this bright and shining Government, proposed to go into the renting of a senator's seat for three months in order to get a place in Parliament, when he found it difficult to get in by way of the Commons. Now, Sir, will some one loan a seat to some one in the North-west so that we could have a Minister of the Interior here?

Well, my hon. friend goes on next, and says that he has no measures; and here again he gives reasons where he better had given none, for the reasons do not seem to be sufficient. What are the reasons why no measures are to be brought down, as put in the mouth of the Governor General? The first reason is this:

It is impossible to lay before you at this session the public accounts for the past year, or indeed any of the reports usually submitted to Parliament. Under these circumstances, and in view of the fact that you will require to reassemble early in the ensuing year, it does not appear expedient to invite your attention to any measures beyond the passage of the supplies.

There are two reasons, one is that you cannot put on the Table of the House the Report of the Public Accounts for the year 1895-96, and that therefore you cannot put any measures before the House. Sir, the absence of the Public Accounts might be a reason for not passing the Estimates under certain circumstances; but it is no reason for not passing these Estimates if these Estimates are simply those that should have been passed in March and April last. Estimates which followed the accounts of the preceding year, and which were put upon the Table. But, Sir, I put it to this House and to the country whether it is any reason for not bringing down legislation, that the Public Accounts for 1895-96 are not on the Table. The fact that the reports of the departments are not on the Table of the House, is no reason, and never was. The only objection that was ever made from the Opposition side of the House on account of the reports not being down, was that we should not pass the Estimates of a department until we knew what the department had done for the preceding year, but it was not urged as a reason for deferring one single measure if there were any measures of importance. Why did not the hon. gentleman treat this House and the country fairly, and say: We do not think it is expedient, under the circumstances, to have any legislation this year, and we are not going to have any;—but not giving a rea-

son which is no reason, a reason which never has been given before, and would not be valid if it were given. But why have they no legislation? They want the reports and the Public Accounts. What for? Do they need the Reports and the Public Accounts in order, for instance, to put legislation upon the statute-book which will give them power, in a legal and parliamentary way, to open negotiations with the Cabinet at Washington for a reciprocity treaty? What reports are necessary for that? Why is not that introduced? If authority is necessary, why is not a legal measure taken in order to bring that question to the front, and to push it forward? For the hon. leader of the Government said, in 1890, in 1894, in 1895, aye, and in 1896, that when they came into power, on that day a commission should go to Washington in order to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States of America. Why has not that been put in motion? Was it a condition absolutely necessary to carrying that out, that the reports should be brought down? But, Sir, there was something else that could have been done; they might have brought in a measure for reducing the salary of the Governor General. My hon. friend, the Postmaster General of the new Cabinet (Mr. Mulock)—who is not now in his place, who is camping elsewhere—on two different occasions introduced a Bill into this House, argued for it, pushed it forward, and it was supported by numerous Liberals in the House—a Bill for reducing the salary of the Governor General from \$50,000 to \$35,000. Has my hon. friend forgotten his zeal of two years ago? Where is the measure which one of the most important members in the Cabinet, should now, if he keeps his promises and professions of two and three years ago, have in a forward state for the consideration of this House? Or where is that other measure that the Postmaster General, that my hon. friend from Queen's, that other hon. gentlemen sitting in the Ministerial benches, and behind the Ministerial benches, declared was a measure of imminent necessity, a measure to reduce the expenses of the departments of Government, and to curtail the departments of Government? Have they forgotten that? Aye, to such an extent, Sir, that instead of proceeding on the plane of curtailing the number of Cabinet offices and curtailing the salaries, they have added to the number of the full Cabinet Ministers, and they have raised the salaries of those who formerly were Controllers, and did not have the full salary of Cabinet Ministers. Do I say they have raised it? No, they have done worse. It has been a commonly accepted theory that until you get the consent of Parliament you cannot appropriate money, and should not appropriate it even by promise; but before my hon. friend got the consent of Parliament, or put a measure before Parliament, he invited gentlemen to go into his