

It winds up in this way:

"Nothing can be more clear from these statements than that Mr. Hector Cameron, in declaring that he had personal and professional interest in the Telegraph Bill, and yet appeared as its advocate before the Committee, was guilty of a gross breach of parliamentary rule, and has exposed every act of which he is capable as representative of the people of North Victoria to the imputation of mercenary motives. If a member receives a fee for supporting one Bill, why may he not receive bribes for sustaining others? If a lawyer can be paid for parliamentary service, why not any member of the House? If the House of Commons does not purge itself of Mr. Hector Cameron it will lower its status very seriously in the estimation of the people of this country, and will justify any future accusations which may be made of undue influence. It is for the Government to take action in this matter. Mr. Cameron is one of their supporters, and no doubt they will be reluctant to condemn him, but condemn him they must, and that speedily. Their standard of purity we all know is not high, but there are some things that Sir John A. Macdonald will not do, and therefore we hope to see him place upon the notice paper a declaration of the impropriety of Mr. Cameron's act with a penalty attached to the repetition of it. We shall leave the electors of North Victoria to deal with the peccant member as their moral sense will direct them."

Now, in reference to this matter, I have only to repeat what I said before, that with the Montreal Telegraph Company I have not now and never had any kind of professional connection. I stated candidly to the Committee that I held the position of standing counsel to the Great North-Western Telegraph Company, and that that was the reason why I declined to vote on this particular question. I did not state, as is falsely asserted in the last article, that I was personally or professionally interested in the Bill. I have neither personal nor professional interest in that Bill, nor any other Bill before this House, and I have been very careful on every occasion not to have any such interest. I have not received any fee and I have no expectation of receiving any fee, for this or any other legislation coming before this House, or for any service connected with my duty as a member of this House. It will not put one cent into my pocket whether the Bill is carried or lost. It does not make one iota of difference to me personally what the result of the Bill may be; but I am not aware that the fact of a professional or personal interest towards that particular Company, which is only indirectly if at all interested in this Bill, precludes me from saying what I think fit to say as an Independent member of Parliament in reference to any legislation before this House. The legislation in question I should have supported on public grounds, quite irrespective of any professional interest in the matter. If I thought fit to adopt different views, I do not suppose they would have altered or changed my relation to the North-Western Telegraph Company. My connection with it is a purely professional one, and in no respect involves any parliamentary duty towards it. The charge from first to last, as to this Bill or any other Bill before the House—and I challenge any member of this House to adopt the suggestion put forward by the *Globe* newspaper, and put upon the journals of this House, or upon the notice paper of this House, a motion to call in question my parliamentary action on any point as to whether I violated the Independence of Parliament Act. As a member of the late Parliament I had sufficient occasion to study very carefully the provisions of that Act in the cases that then arose. I am well aware of them all, and I say without hesitation that, neither in reference to this Bill or any other Bill with which I have been connected, have I ever had any personal or professional interest which in any way could possibly interfere or prevent, or make it an act of impropriety on my part, to discuss and judge a Bill and to express my opinions upon any private or public measure before the House. It has usually happened that I have had occasion to take charge of a good many Bills, this Session more particularly, possibly owing to what is really a misfortune that I am a reasonably active member of the different Committees, that I have that kind of professional knowledge of legislation that enables me to take charge of them, perhaps with more readiness

than members who are not so skilled. I have been engaged to accept with great reluctance the charge of many Bills, but in no single instance have I had any personal or pecuniary interest in any one of them in the remotest degree. I think that is a sufficient answer to the general charge. I shall only conclude by saying that this attack upon me is, of course, as every one knows, instigated by political hostilities. It has come to my knowledge that the idea of it originated in the Committee when this matter was under discussion; that the managing editor of the *Globe* was then present, and that he said in the hearing of some of my friends who happened to be wedged in close to him in the crowded Committee room, that he would make what then occurred the subject of an attack upon me; that he repeated that statement publicly in a public conveyance, in a railway train between here and Toronto, and this article is simply following up the threat then made use of by him; that he would endeavor to make political capital against me out of what occurred in that Committee room. I have been informed of that, and I have no doubt of the veracity on that point of my informants. As for that individual, the managing editor of the *Globe*, I have, fortunately for myself, for a great many years past—seven or eight years—not had any kind of personal acquaintance or intimacy with him. I have had such a contempt for his conduct and his action and the manner in which he conducts that newspaper, that I have felt that it was an advantage to me that I was not obliged to acknowledge an acquaintance with him even when I met him on the street. The remarks the hon. Minister of Railways thought fit to make upon him the other night, I entirely endorse. His action is that of a cowardly assassin who has not the courage to attack a political opponent upon public and legitimate grounds, which ought to afford a basis for attack if any attack should be made, but he comes behind and tries to stab his political opponent in the back in a cowardly and contemptible manner. I do not think it is desirable to notice all the personal attacks of this kind that are made upon members, but inasmuch as it has come to my knowledge, as I have stated, that this article was inspired, and not only inspired but actually written, by that individual in pursuance of a threat that he openly and publicly made, I think I am quite justified in referring to him. Why, he actually has the audacity, in the concluding sentence of this article, to talk about the moral sense of the electors of North Victoria, as if he could have the slightest appreciation of what moral sense was. I should like to know whether the articles in the *Globe*, in reference to its political opponents, show that the writer of them has the remotest idea of what moral sense is? Why, he has not the moral sense of a dog. A dog attacks his enemy openly. It barks and flies at him openly and fairly, but this contemptible journal by its contemptible managing editor, comes behind in a sneaking and contemptible manner, like a snake, and tries to spit its venom into its enemy, trying to kill its victims in the dark and on the sly. I feel such a contempt for the course which this journalist has pursued in reference to every man who happens to be opposed to him politically, that, perhaps, I am too warm in the expressions I am making use of; if I am I apologize to the House. But really it is impossible not to feel indignation against a journal who has for years past continually violated every principle of legitimate warfare. If it has anything to say against any man let it say it openly and plainly. If it has anything to say against any member of this House let it say so openly and plainly, and not bring forward insinuations and foul attacks which neither it nor any of its friends dare attempt to justify openly against myself or any other hon. member of this House.

Mr. TASSÉ. I regret very much to have to follow the example of my hon. friend and trouble this House on a per-