

the Estimates last year to pay it. These gentlemen are two prominent merchants in the port from which I came. They were and are great personal friends of mine, and have been strong political friends of mine in the past.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will come to the key of the position. When it was probable that an election might occur, a gentleman who had for years been my friend, who had supported me for years, who had got into my buggy and gone over portions of the county and canvassed the county in July last with me, was approached by some members of the Cabinet for the purpose of endeavoring to induce him to come out and oppose Mr. Mitchell. Then it became necessary to go around and work up the influences in the county which were necessary to defeat Mr. Mitchell, and this was one of them. These two influential gentlemen, who are still great personal friends of mine, were led to understand that, if they would sign Mr. Adams' requisition, then the Liberal-Conservative convention having committed itself to hostility to me, the knowledge that two influential friends of mine would oppose me would largely influence the county in regard to the vote which Mr. Adams would get. The next thing was that Mr. Adams was sent for. Whether he was sent for by the Government or not I do not know; but he came to Ottawa, and the word came down that if these gentlemen would sign the requisition and would support Mr. Adams, that which Peter Mitchell could not get from a sense of justice and fair play would be given to them as a matter of political exigency. When it was attempted to get up political meetings against me, though I know they were very loath to do it, they attended some meetings of these conventions. Then an Order in Council was passed, and I believe it was held over for some time in order to see if they were firmly fixed in their opposition to me; and then what Peter Mitchell could not settle, though over a year had elapsed since the award was made, the imminence of the election made it desirable should be paid, so that these men might be conciliated. Was there any reason for this being paid in January or February last more than there was for its being paid in the previous January or February? Why was it not put in the Estimates of last year? The award was made in the previous December, and I should like to have some explanation of this. The Finance Minister has stated that he agrees with the mover of the resolution in regard to Governor General's warrants and the inexpediency of using them as they have been used.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad that the hon. gentleman agrees with me in that. I think that the House and every member in it should be anxious to see that no improper use is made of these Governor's warrants for one purpose or the other. Certainly, they should not be used on the eve of an election in order to defeat members who have generally supported the Government in past years, but who have stated their opinions on the floor of this House and have chosen to differ from the Government, and have had the courage of their convictions in that regard. If a member who does that is to be blackballed and tabooed, and if the public moneys are to be used in order to get up an opposition to him, then it is time that we were a little more strict in regard to the use of Governor General's warrants. That is all I have to say about that matter just now.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat says that this matter was settled for a purpose, referring to what occurred in his county. This is the first time I have heard that alleged, so far as I am concerned —

Mr. MITCHELL. I exonerated you.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Although I thank the hon. gentleman for his confidence in me, he must be aware that I share with my colleagues all the odium there may be in this matter. Of course, being a member of the Government, no matter what my colleagues may do, I share in the responsibility of their acts, as they share in the responsibility of my acts. With reference to this matter, the hon. gentleman states correctly that he came to me several times to get it settled. He was aware that the matter could not be settled there and then. I tried to have it settled according to the award, but, as is usually the case, the matter was referred to the Minister of Justice to ascertain his opinion whether we should pay the award or appeal to a higher tribunal, and the Minister of Justice thought the award should be appealed from. This occurred during the last Session. Later on during the summer, the parties interested came and tried to get the Government to give them the amount of the award, which was \$8,000, and the interest which, at the date of settlement, would have been about \$3,800, and the costs, \$500, which would have amounted to \$12,300.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was Mr. Adams with them?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember. I know the parties interested came about this case. Is Mr. Adams a lawyer?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Well, I suppose he came as a lawyer, but I do not remember whether he was alone or with one of these gentlemen who are mentioned here; but, at all events, parties interested came to my Department, and after discussing the matter I told them that I would recommend that the award alone, \$8,000, should be concurred in, and that there should be no interest or costs. I submitted the matter to Council, but the hon. gentleman knows I cannot say what occurred there. The result of the decision of the Council was what the hon. gentleman sees on this paper: we agreed to pay \$8,000 instead of \$12,300, and as that sum was the award, we procured a Governor General's warrant for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I can tell you what took place in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. There was a good deal of the Old Adam in it, I think.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Could the Finance Minister explain how it was necessary that warrants should issue in favor of a Royal Commission on Railways for \$20,000, when I find it was not necessary to issue any in respect to the Commission appointed to enquire into the management of Indian affairs in the North-West?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not able to state to the hon. gentleman what reason there was in the one case more than the other; but I think he will agree with me that it is not usual to find gentlemen of the position and ability necessary for such a commission as this Railway Commission, to travel all over the country, and spend a long period of time, at large expense, without being paid. However, I do not understand him as taking any exception to the amount provided for the payment of the Railway Commission.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister, last year, gave a distinct pledge to the House that there would be a commission appointed to examine into Indian affairs. It was charged against certain members of the House that they had made statements that were not correct, which were really false, and the Administration declared that the charges made against them were not true, and the First Minister pledged himself in the following words: —