

### REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said he would like at this point to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Cartwright) if he would have any objection to laying on the table of the House the receipts and expenditures down to the 10th April, and he would just say in relation to this that it had been the practice of the Government on all former occasions, when the tariff was under consideration, to give the latest possible information in reference to the important questions of the revenue and expenditure. He did not say that the return would be a correct criterion as to the revenue, and was aware that it would be an abnormal return for that period.

This he considered would be information of the greatest importance to enable them to arrive at correct conclusions as to the revenue and expenditure for the current year. The hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) would remember that the late Minister of Finance brought down this information.

**Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT** said such a return would be of a misleading character. He could not see that that return would give any information to the House.

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said he would be sorry if the Finance Minister declined to give the return asked for. If he did, he must ask him to defer proceeding with his resolutions until the forms of the House would permit him to test the sense of the House upon the subject by a motion that he would bring forward. He considered it would be quite safe to trust the House with the information, and that there need be no more fear of the House being misled by it than there was of the Finance Minister who had the statement before him.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON:** *Cui bono?* (Who benefits by it?)

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said there was an important issue between himself and the Finance Minister. The House was asked to impose additional taxation to the extent of \$3,000,000, and it was important that the members of the House should have the fullest possible information the Government could offer them. They could exercise their judgment in the same manner as the Hon. Minister of Finance could exercise his, and great assistance would be rendered to them by this information, which was now in the exclusive possession of the Government, and which had never been refused in any Parliament.

**Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT** said that he did not recollect ever having heard or seen a statement of revenue and expenditure for ten days being asked for of any hon. gentleman in his position before.

**Hon. Mr. HOLTON** considered that a resolution of a factional character like the one referred to would be of no service to the hon. gentleman opposite. The hon. gentleman had gone far enough to let them see the line of argument he proposed taking. He had no objection to the papers being laid upon the table, but he maintained that it was not usual to ask for them, and they would answer no practical purpose. The hon. gentleman no doubt intended to argue from the return that the proposed additional taxation was not necessary, as so much might be expected at the same rate for the next six months, and therefore additional taxation would not be

required. This was the only line of argument that could be drawn from the return and that would be utterly fallacious.

**Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD** said if returns were not worth even printing, there could be no harm in bringing down the return. He agreed that it was a slight upon the intelligence of the members of the House to state that the return would mislead them while it was transparent to the Hon. Minister of Finance. He thought when a member of Parliament asked for a return that it ought to be brought down.

**Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE** was of opinion that the return would not convey much information, and all that could possibly be done with it was to deduce from it an argument of the character that had been already referred to.

**Hon. Mr. TUPPER** said it would be an obvious fallacy for him to attempt to draw such an argument from the facts which would be contained in the return. He reiterated that they should have the fullest information upon the subject given to them when it was proposed to impose \$3,000,000 additional taxation. As the Government would not consent to bring down the return, he would regard it as his duty to put a motion asking for the return upon notice.

The matter then dropped.

\* \* \*

### THE RIEL DIFFICULTY

**Mr. MASSON** resumed the debate on the Riel question. He contended that the reception by the Canadian Government of the delegates from the Provisional Government of Assiniboine implied an amnesty. He denied that there had been any action either on the part of the people of the Northwest or the French members of the House to provoke the course pursued by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Rochester). He was glad, however, to say that the course taken by the majority of the English members of the House had been marked by great moderation and forbearance.

If it were true that Riel had acted towards Scott as had been pretended, it would be sufficient to extinguish the least spark of sympathy on the part of his friends. The act of amnesty was not intended to pass the sponge over the death of Scott alone, but over the deaths of poor Parisien and Boulet of which we seldom hear. He denied that Scott had been killed because he was an Orangeman, the French people having no antipathy against them. He denied that the French half-breeds had been recreant to their duty, as had been attempted to be shown, as they and their leaders had at once come out to the defence of their country.

In proof of their loyalty he quoted from *Métis* of the 5th March 1870, the day after the proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor was published, which called upon the people to take up arms and repulse O'Donoghue and his followers. Riel's followers had offered their services on the 3rd, but it was not until the 8th that they knew their services were required. Then they immediately responded, and went to the front. It was on the 11th that it was known that the Fenians had been repulsed; then how could it be said that Riel had only tendered his services after the trouble was over? He proceeded