

times compelled, by political exigencies, to write in disregard of those considerations by which, under ordinary circumstances, they would be guided.

I entirely concur in the above.

DON. A. SMITH.

GEO. STEPHEN.

“ London, 16th December, 1880.”

I think, Sir, I have verified for the hon. gentleman the second claim which I freely accord to him his fitness for his trusted and elevated position in the party to which he belongs. I admit also that he has special qualifications for the particular office in the Ministry to which he has been elevated. We know that grievous complaint has been made for some time by the people of Manitoba and the North-West as to the effect of high duties upon that country, and the hon. gentleman has given us the advantage of his views as to the remedy for those grievances. We know that, in 1873, he formulated his views thus :

“ A 15 per cent. tariff means more than 15 per cent. protection to manufacturers. There is the cost of the transport of goods from the other side of the water, which amounts, on an average, to, at least, 5 per cent., so that there is now a protection equal to 20 per cent. That ought to be sufficient for any industry suited to the country; and, as to others, it would be unwise to attempt to sustain them by fiscal proprs.”

There is another special claim which the hon. gentleman has of fitness for his position. You know how the people of Manitoba complain, and have complained, of railway monopoly, and of the action of the Dominion Government in depriving them of freedom of railway communication; and you also remember—for it has been frequently quoted in this House—the statement the hon. gentleman made when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was going through, as to its effect, or rather its want of effect, so far as Manitoba was concerned, as to the Province being perfectly free, and, therefore, he is just the man to vindicate the rights of Manitoba in that regard. There may be many other things as to which his views may not be so acceptable to the people of Manitoba. They think they have some hardships to complain of, while we all remember that he told us that they are rather more spoon-fed than otherwise. I am afraid I have not exhausted the list, but I hope that the hon. gentlemen I have overlooked, if I have overlooked any, will not suppose that I refuse to them the compliments I have paid their colleagues; but even as far as I have gone, I think it will be admitted that the changes in the Administration, whether by resignation or by removal, or by addition or by transfers of offices, are very large, very numerous and very important. In my opinion, the Ministry is less worthy, if possible, of confidence than it has been at any former period; but I have no doubt, Sir, that the majority will say that the Ministry as it was, was the best possible Ministry except the Ministry as it is. That, I have no doubt, is the opinion of the majority of this House. From that opinion there is but one appeal, and I hope we may soon have it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, with every regard for the hon. gentleman and for his statements, I venture to have a doubt as to the veracity of the last statement—that he is anxious to go back to the people. I am quite satisfied that in the inmost recesses of his heart it is the last thing he would like at this moment. I am satisfied that he knows—and he has so committed himself—that he has played so fast and loose between Upper and Lower Canada, between Quebec and Ontario, that in the case of an election taking place to-morrow, he would find that in Upper Canada his attempts to coquette with Quebec would lose him the confidence of his own section of the Dominion, without gaining him the confidence of any other part. Mr. Speaker, we were summoned here by the representative of our Sovereign for the transaction of business. We have come here to perform a solemn duty. It is the duty of a Government to introduce and to press such measures as they think it is for the

benefit of the country to be introduced and to be pressed. It is the duty of those who agree with them to give them a cordial and united support, and it is equally the duty of those who are opposed to the Government conscientiously to raise such objections as they think just, to the course of any administration or legislation of the Government. But it is also the duty—the recognised duty of an Opposition, of every Opposition, to sink party and personal conflict, when they can do any good by co-operating with the Government, co-operating with the majority of the day, for the good of the country, and for that reason it is an understood principle in England, a principle which has obtained there since representative government in modern times has prevailed, that there ought to be something like good feeling between the majority and the minority, and that while conscientiously, openly and boldly, offering opposition to such measures as we disapprove of, we should endeavor to have something like gentlemanly intercourse and good feeling across the floor. I would ask you, Sir, and I would ask this House and through this House the country, if the speech of the hon. gentleman from that point of view will not carry with it its own condemnation. I suppose, Sir, he is a good Christian, an evangelical Christian, and, therefore, bound to have a Christian feeling towards all his fellow men. But, I would ask you, Sir, if the hon. gentleman has not, without purpose, without provocation, without benefit or advantage to any man or woman, without advantage to any interest, but to the great disadvantage of the progress of public business and of the public good, attempted, in a mere malignant desire, to wound people's feelings, in an unchristian, ungentlemanlike, and unparliamentary desire to set section against section, individual against individual, man against man, to rake up these old stories and these old quarrels. For what good could possibly be expected from the course the hon. gentleman has taken? Why, Sir, it is because he had not anything to say against the Speech from the Throne; he had not anything to say in answer to the very statesmenlike speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address, and so he had carefully to gather up this garbage and this record of old quarrels and old disputes long forgotten, in order to divert the attention of this House and this country from the feebleness of any attack that he could make against the Government, against its legislation or against its administration. The hon. gentleman has come back from England with renewed health and vigor; he has taken his position as leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, and he has shown that he has recovered that health which we were sorry to see, at the end of last Session, had somewhat failed; but while he has been restored to good health, the old temper and disposition have remained. The hon. gentleman went home to England; I went home to England. He finds it a great fault that I should go home to England, and that I should receive some little attention from some of my political friends in England. He brings it a charge against me that I dined with the members of a club of which I myself was a member, on which occasion I made a speech. The hon. gentleman went home to England and he made a speech—

Mr. LANDERKIN. We are proud of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I dare say the hon. gentleman is proud of it. But the hon. gentleman thought my speech at the St. George's Club was worthy of some remark, and he spoke about my exaggeration, when I said that every acre in the Dominion of Canada was in a healthful climate; the hon. gentleman foisted in the word “ beautiful.” If the word beautiful is in my speech as reported, I never used that word. I spoke of the Dominion of Canada being a beautiful country, and so it is, notwithstanding the disparagement of the honorable gentleman. I spoke of the country as fit for the settlement of