

upon this maxim, and I have said if you were right how do you turn about now and tell us in the course of a few months that we are wrong in doing the same thing? Consequently, I may remind them that they are preaching and professing what they never seemed to believe when in power. They cannot possibly forget that the Hon. Senator Foster, who is now dead, not only received a contract from the Government, but that the hands of the Ministers were thrust into the Exchequer, and \$45,000 of public money taken therefrom and paid to Mr. Foster. Nor can they forget that members of this House owning railways, had many tons of rails loaned to them by the Government in order to enable them to construct their roads. I remember one particular instance in which an hon. gentleman rose in this House and condemned the Government for not giving him the rails; he went back to his constituents and said: "I told Mr. Mackenzie that if he would not give me rails enough to rail my road, I would not support his Government." What was the result? The hon. gentleman got the rails, and he supported the Government. Now, there is not an hon. gentleman opposite who believes that any favor the Government could grant would make me a more ardent supporter than I am. I have always been a Conservative, although I have endeavored to treat my opponents as courteously as possible. But I desire to direct their attention to the opinion of an hon. gentleman, whose opinion they ought to respect, whose opinion they did once respect when he had power and patronage; I refer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). Many hon. gentlemen present must recall, as I recall, sitting in the press gallery at the time, that in 1877 the Speaker of the House was charged with receiving patronage from the Government, and Mr. McLeod, a member from New Brunswick, was charged with receiving \$10,000 for transporting rails; what was the defence of the hon. member for East York at that time, when the leader of the present Government made those charges against hon. gentlemen? He said, addressing an audience at Newmarket:

"No language could be too strong to denounce such a statement as this. I recollect reading an incident related of a man who was known to be a very profane swearer. He was taking a load of pumpkins up a long hill, when some boys came up from behind, took out the tailboard of the waggon. His horses sprung forward, and he looked back to see all his pumpkins rolling down the hill. He sat speechless, and the boy said: 'Why don't you swear?' 'I can't; why, no language can do justice to the occasion.' No language, I say, can be put in the mouth of a man to denounce so shameless a piece of political profligacy—to denounce such a speech, as that from a gentleman in his high position—a statement so scandalous in its conception, so infamous in its utterance."

At that time the present leader of the Government was arraigning the existing Government for its offences against the Independence of Parliament Act. The hon. member for East York further said:

"Let him name a member or a man who, as he says, was bought by the giving of a contract. Surely he does not refer to the case of Mr. Anglin, for, as every one knows, I had no firmer and few abler supporters in Parliament than the member for Gloucester from the moment I first took office. We had worked together in almost everything since I sat in Parliament; and it is a curious thing if one is to be obliged to buy one's staunchest friends."

The Reform party were jubilant over this maxim; but to-day, ready to turn with any fashionable gale, they condemn those who, not in their own interests, but in the interest of the constituencies they represent, are endeavoring to advance public enterprises by expending a portion of the surplus an active and industrious Conservative Government have rolled up. We are to be condemned as criminals by hon. gentlemen opposite, who placed on the Statute-book the very law that allows members of Parliament to be shareholders in corporations which secure patronage from the Government; they are prepared to assume a virtue though they know they have it not. Now, Sir, what is the truth with regard to this Independence of Parliament Act? We have been lectured to-night about it, and have been told how wrong it

Mr. MACKINTOSH.

was. I ask hon. gentlemen who put the existing law on the Statute-book, and why they put it there? The Government of the hon. member for East York inserted that clause in the Act—and what for? For the very purpose of allowing hon. gentlemen opposite to participate in profits derived from business done through companies with the Government. And yet, as soon as they were caught, so soon as the public eye was on them, instead of facing the public and admitting they had done wrong, they brazened out the offence and used a powerful majority to bolster up their corrupt cause. This was the provision they placed on the Statute-book:

"This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons, by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except companies undertaking contracts for the building of public works, and any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Why was that passed? because Mr. Norris, who was unseated for his offence, was proved guilty of having received \$40,000 of patronage from the Government of Mr. Mackenzie, and by whitewashing him, they opened the way for further inroads on the public Treasury, and placed on the Statute-book, this clause which they now blame Conservatives for having transacted business under.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Norris resigned.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. He did resign, but when on a public platform he was accused by Mr. Miller of having a contract with the Government, he denied it, and expressed the wish that his hand might wither before he would sign a contract with the Government; and when the investigation took place in this House, it was found that he might not have signed the contract, but that one of his relatives probably signed it, and he became again a candidate for the representation of the county of Lincoln, and the hon. member for Bothwell knows that. Now, we have been told that this Government has assisted its friends by giving them timber limits. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has made it perfectly clear that there has been no favoritism shown towards Conservatives—that Liberals as well as Conservatives have had the opportunity of doing business with the Department of the Interior; but we can remember when that hon. gentleman, referred to in this debate as the sturdy and unbending Premier of Ontario, Mr. Mowat, made grants of timber limits to his friends. We can recall when the Hon. R. W. Scott secured the commissionership of Crown Lands under the Administration of Mr. Blake, in consequence of a telegram sent to him from the city of Ottawa, saying, "Do not take anything unless you can get the Crown Lands." So soon as those gentlemen were in power we find that Oliver, Davidson & Co.—Mr. Oliver being at the time a member of the Local Legislature—purchased 24,800 acres in 1872-73 from the Ontario Government in the townships of Blake, Crooks, and Pardee, in the Thunder Bay District, obtaining mineral land at \$1 per acre. This did not give them the title to the pine timber; but after the purchase, Mr. Oliver procured an Order in Council allowing the owners of the land to purchase the pine on the property at 50 cents an acre. Oliver, Davidson & Co., availed themselves of this Order, and in October, 1873 it was revoked. Oliver, Davidson & Co. secured their lands at \$1 an acre, re-sold them again for some \$97,000, and they are held to-day by Mr. Carpenter at \$400,000. More than that, I will tell hon. gentlemen that in the case of Mr. Birkett, a wealthy and influential citizen of Ottawa, when he was refused by the present Government a renewal of the lease he had in the disputed territory, on the ground that the dispute between the Ontario and the Dominion Governments was not settled, the secretary and organizer of the Reform party, Mr. Preston, wrote a letter to his father in this city, saying that if Mr. Birkett would give him one-half interest, he would secure the title from Mr. Mowat, and Mr. Birkett could endeavor to settle his matter at this