

dollar we have undertaken. If hon. gentlemen opposite will only give this country fair play, if they will remember that though they are in Opposition they yet owe some obligation to the country itself, if they will remember that they may attack the Government in regard to financial administration, and the conduct of the Departments, but keep their hands off the country itself—I venture to say that the future will be brighter, will be one of which none of us need be ashamed. The hon. gentleman opposite has also been pleased to refer to the speech made by the hon. leader of the Government in Toronto, in which he said he would prefer annexation to independence. But, Sir, what was the occasion of that speech? There was a demand in certain quarters in the country for an immediate severance of the tie that binds us to the Mother Country, and the establishment of a national independence. That demand came from the newspapers representing the wing of the Liberal party, which is popularly supposed to be identified in sentiment with the hon. leader of the Opposition. It was urged upon the ground that political independence would put us in a position to secure more favorable trade relations with the United States, something in the nature of a continental Zollverein. But if influenced by that hope, we secured an independence to-morrow, do hon. gentlemen imagine that the people of the United States—who naturally would prefer that this whole continent should be politically theirs—in order to preserve our independence, in order to give us that separate national existence on this continent which we had sacrificed so much to obtain, would give us those trade relations? Not a bit of it; on the contrary, they would draw the cords in trade matters more strongly than they are to-day, until men, sickened of the poor results of their past efforts at independence, would say “let us have annexation, it is the only thing now for us to get in order that we have the trade relations that we have desired.” It was no wonder that the right hon. leader of the Government said better have annexation at once than such a miserable interregnum between the two countries as the result of this deliberate policy, which they would adopt to prevent our getting those trade relations as an independent community which we have not now, knowing all the time that the effect would be to cause us to look for them in another direction. Sir, the right hon. gentleman requires no certificate of loyalty at my hands; his whole career in Canada has been one of fidelity to the Mother Country. Why, the very charge which hon. gentlemen have urged against him was that so true has he been in his allegiance to the Mother Country, that he has even sacrificed this country in the interest of the Empire; that was the charge made from one end of this country to the other a few years ago. And now they willfully misunderstand and mis-state a speech delivered by him, and they undertake to pose themselves as the special loyalists of Canada, and ask us to believe that the right hon. gentleman was untrue to the Empire. He requires no certificate of loyalty from either inside or outside of this House; his record is his best certificate. And wherever he is known, whether on the other side of the water or on this, he is known to be a true servant of the Queen; a true, loyal subject, an earnest, devoted statesman, who has with self-sacrifice, such as no man in Canada has ever made before, given a valuable life to the service of his country which he might have used to the enrichment of himself; and when he passes from us he will occupy in the hearts and memories of the people of Canada, as no public man has ever done before, the proud position of its best and ablest statesman.

Mr. LANDRY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and (at 2.25 o'clock, a.m.) the House adjourned.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FRIDAY, 17th March, 1882.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 116) to prevent the amalgamation of railways directly or indirectly under the control of the Parliament of Canada, unless under express provisions in the Acts respecting each of the companies amalgamated; and to provide that in no case shall such amalgamation be lawful, unless and until bonuses or privileges of any kind paid or granted to either company by any municipality, be previously repaid or restored, or the grant or promise thereof cancelled.—(Mr. McCuaig.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Leonard Tilley: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to cast on the present debate that valuable light which other speakers, more eloquent and better informed than I, have caused to shine upon it, I will not say since a few days, but from the time that this question of the Tariff was submitted, now three years ago, to the deliberations of this House and the approval of the country. Such is not my intention. Moreover, the question has been thoroughly elucidated; theoretically by learned dissertations developed by both protectionists and free traders, with all the knowledge they were capable of, in presence of this deliberative assembly; practically, by the working of the new Tariff. What more could be desired? I would certainly not speak to-day if I had nothing better to do than to tread well-beaten paths, and following in the steps of my leaders, to send up to heaven an eternal hosanna of admiring approval. Representatives of the people, we have other duties to fulfil, and we must leave to the past and to the men whose popular confidence has deserted, the care of recovering these lost vestiges, this embodiment of the servitude of the will and of the intellect. Totally different is the spectacle which meets our gaze to-day, a new evil shows its face even in the midst of the assembly where are deliberating the representatives of the nation, and the nation which is after all the sufferer, calls upon us to arrest this flood which threatens to overthrow everything. I am referring to that deliberate manner of acting of certain people, which has become systematic, of falsifying public documents when quoting them, of altering facts and figures, in brief of deceiving one's audience and the people who read us. This system is much more in vogue than one would imagine, and if for some time back it has invaded the columns of a certain press, it has found in this very House devoted proselytes who have endorsed it by their adoption of it. Some there are who have acted with malice prepense and with good-will, but the majority, I doubt not, have unawares, and in perfect good faith, lent the aid of an honest tongue to this unceasing propagation of error. What do the motives matter, after all? The error remains and we have to fight it, under whatever shape it comes before us. And it is because it has made its appearance in this House, and that a servile sheet has published it *con amore* in our Province, that I wish to raise my voice in protest, Mr. Speaker, and re-establish the truth if possible. In other words, I intend combatting the