

is. We know that it is somewhere in the Gulf, we know that it is an important terminus, we know that it is one of the termini proposed for the ocean steamships. My opinion is that the failure of the negotiations with the Andersons in regard to the new mail line must be owing to the insistence of the Government that they should include Shippegan among the points at which their fast steamers were to call. It will be observed that, in the debate of 1886, I pointed delicately to the fact that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) was the owner of at least eleven-twelfths of the Caranquet enterprise, and upon that occasion the First Minister pointed out the meritorious character of the attitude of the hon. member for Gloucester in that regard, and stated—and I cordially agree with him in that respect—that, but for the enthusiasm, as he called it, of the hon. member for Gloucester, the railway would not have got so far as it had. During the electoral campaign of 1886-7, I quoted, and I admit not infrequently, the facts which I have narrated here to-day. I stated these facts, and I used the member for Gloucester as a shocking example. On various platforms I pointed out the circumstances which, I conceived, rendered it inconsistent with the independence of a member of Parliament that he should occupy the relation to the company and to the Executive which he did in connection with this railway. For that course I was the recipient of a very severe rebuke, nay, of two very severe rebukes from a pair of Ministers who were perambulating Ontario upon the occasion of the campaign. At London the First Minister said this:

"Mr. Blake said in his speech at Ottawa the other day, with respect to the system of granting bonuses to railways:

"What we wanted to show was the relation which existed between the members of Parliament and the Executive, which prevented the former from independently exercising their duty in Parliament. How could a member of Parliament be supposed to vote conscientiously on a question when he knew that the memorial for his railway subsidy was in the Minister's office, and its being granted depended upon whether that vote was yes or nay? It was not in human nature to do otherwise when business was being conducted in this way. The influence of party was strong. The difficulties of a man separating himself from his party—more especially when that party was in power—were many; and if the influences of the Executive were added to these, and the relations the member bears to both, the greater become the barriers in the way. Why! the member's vote is in the Minister's pocket."

And the hon. gentleman went on to say:

"So Mr. Blake was of opinion that no subsidy should be given to any railway in any part of Canada if a member or his constituency was in any way interested in it. How could a member be independent, said he, if a railway going through the constituency was before the Government or before Parliament?"

You will observe that the hon. gentleman adopted that method of argument which we have heard so often from him for these many years, and with which we are quite familiar—he misapprehended, I will say, the point, and misapprehending it, of course, he misstated it. He alleged here that I objected to a member of Parliament advocating the interest of his constituency in reference to a railway. I objected to nothing of the kind. I objected to a member of Parliament putting himself in such a position that his pecuniary interest conflicted with his public duty. The hon. gentleman went on:

"Why, gentlemen, the principle in England and in Canada is very plain. No member of Parliament can vote on any measure in which he is personally interested,

and if he is not personally interested it is his duty, gentlemen, to do all he can for his constituents. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Why, according to Mr. Blake's interpretation of the duty of a member of Parliament, your good member, Mr. Carling, would be guilty of a dereliction of duty, if he had fought for the railway going through here westward, and so with all members of Parliament."

This, Sir, was an unfortunate allusion; for many in that audience must have remembered with shame, that it had been discovered that the present Minister of Agriculture, to whom the hon. gentleman was referring, had, while retaining the outward appearance of disinterested independence, entered into a private bargain in connection with the first, the Allan, Canadian Pacific contract, under which he secured to himself a half share in the interest of the late Major Walker, one of the directors and chief subscribers, with whom Mr. Carling was a secret partner; and thus became personally interested in securing contract terms the most favorable to the company, and the least favorable to the country he was professing to serve. The hon. gentleman continued:

"If this doctrine be true, no member of Parliament can fight for any railway which directly or indirectly benefits him or his constituency. I do not believe in that doctrine. I believe the people send members to Parliament to do the best they can for their constituents, and the more he works for his constituency the better. To show you how unjust these charges made against some members of Parliament are, I will give you one instance. There is Mr. Patrick Burns—"

It was not Patrick; but he was speaking largely to an Irish audience, and he thought he might thus insinuate that the member for Gloucester was an Irishman. His name is Kennedy, not Patrick.—

"There is Mr. Patrick Burns, the member for Gloucester, in the Province of New Brunswick. He is a Roman Catholic gentleman—"

Therefore, of course, he is a Paddy!—

"He is a Roman Catholic gentleman, coming from Ireland, and he has, by hard work and good character and great ability, made a considerable fortune. He was anxious to assist his constituents; he was anxious that a railway should be built—the Caranquet Railway—to the sea. He found that nobody would come forward—because railway enterprises have not been profitable in Canada—and out of public spirit he put his hands in his own pocket and spent his own money, and after doing so, so far as prudence would allow, he came to Parliament in order to get assistance. We had only to consider whether it was a good road, one for the advantage to the country, or not. We found it was to the advantage of the country, and we gave the road a grant, and Mr. Blake attacked him by name, charging him with corruption, because he held the stock of that road, when nobody else would come forward to his assistance. I said, when the matter was brought up, that he deserved great credit for his public spirit and for having put his money into the enterprise. Why, his independence was not gone, because he was already a Conservative of the strongest type, elected to support the Government (hear, hear and cheers); and it was certain he would support the Government whether he got the money or not. We were only too glad to assist Mr. Burns in his patriotic efforts, by giving it a reasonable grant to help him to build the road."

Then the hon. Minister of Justice followed in the same strain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did he call him Patrick, too?

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, no; I do not think his dignity would have permitted him to do that. It is only the First Minister who can afford to unbind in that way. Says the Minister of Justice:

"We have the policy of slander in the Province of Ontario. The men who represent you, you are told from platform to platform, have been selling their hands with public treasure. I observe that in the speeches delivered in Ontario that matter is not so foolishly handled as it used to be, and special prominence is given to members