

the Franchise Act, and to the accumulation of a great fund of money which we know was lavishly used in the election and the results of which we see to-day. There has been no free expression of public sentiment. The right hon. gentleman, I believe, asserted that I got some money from Michigan. I think this assertion was made when he visited some friends in Toronto, when he called together the manufacturers of that city to meet him. It is said that the right hon. gentleman once appealed to a meeting of manufacturers, when asking for election funds, and told them that they ought to remember their friends; that they should not act like the swine picking up the apples under the trees, without remembering the bountiful and munificent hand that was shaking down the apples. The right hon. gentleman appealed to the manufacturers in this case, and he went on to say that the Reformers were accumulating a fund, that Charlton had been to Michigan appealing to the lumbermen of that State, and that he had come back with a large amount of money. Well, as the hon. gentleman made this statement in a way that gave it publicity, I may say that I had not been in Michigan for many months, that I never received a dollar from Michigan or any other portion of the United States for any political purpose whatever. With regard to the use of money in the elections, I may state that it was with the utmost difficulty that the Reform party were able to raise a meagre sum of less than ten thousand dollars to pay the expenses of committees, to furnish campaign literature, and to supply speakers in various parts of the country. So far as any influences of that kind were used, if used at all, they were used on the side of the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman boasts that he came to this House from the country with a majority at his back, but I tell him that he has not come here with the verdict of a free unbiassed expression of opinion by the people, but that he comes here by virtue of the Gerry-mander, the Franchise Act and boodle.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks of something I said in Toronto. Well, I dare say that is a subject which will come up in this House at another time, and then we will discuss more about it and where it came from. As regards the statement that we do not represent the people of Canada, that we are not here by a full, fair expression of the majority of the people—that I deny; and the statement is only made by hon. gentlemen opposite because they were utterly disappointed by the result of the election. Although there was the Gerry-mander Bill, as they call it, although there was this objection and that objection, hon. gentlemen opposite were satisfied they were going to carry the country. There is indubitable evidence that they made arrangements in the belief that they were going to be transferred from the cool shades of opposition to this side of the House. There is indubitable evidence before us and before the country that hon. gentlemen were so satisfied of that, that all the preliminary arrangements of many of them were made so that they could at once take full possession and govern this country. Here in Ottawa, in Toronto, and in other great centres we know that there were proscriptive lists made out, equal to those which were prepared by the old Roman triumvirates, to cut off the heads of the unfortunate Conservatives who had offices worth anything, and perhaps in a good many cases their successors were already indicated. We know that a great many men worked at the election with the understanding that Mr. Blake was certain to come in, and that the Tories had at last come to the end of their tether. The Conservatives were going out and the Reformers were coming in, and I am sorry to say that we have found, in very many cases, that the civil servants, believing in the open and ostentatious statements as to the certainty of the Reformers carrying the country—and they were told at the same time

in Prince Edward Island and elsewhere that they would be punished if they did not vote on the winning side—I say we found that these civil servants, a body which used to be said was of course going with the Government of the day, were voting as a general rule against the Government for fear of their being dismissed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, for fear of being dismissed by the incoming Government. The policy of *ux victis* was going to be carried out to the utmost extent; and I ask the hon. gentlemen if that does not prove that they fully expected to carry the country, gerrymander or no gerrymander. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they did not believe until the last hour that they were going to carry the country. The people of Canada had before them the whole policy of the Government of the day for the last eight years; they had before them the statements of a different policy which would be pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the people of Canada showed their approval of the policy of the Government, both as to its legislation and its administration, by returning a large majority in its favor. It was a very remarkable thing that they should have done so for the third time in succession, because we all know that just as the people of Athens tired of hearing Aristides called "the just," so the people of Canada might be supposed to be tired of hearing that the National Policy was a great success, that the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was an exhibition of great administrative ability and boldness, and had raised the prestige and credit of Canada to an enormous extent, and therefore it might naturally be supposed that we could not last forever, and hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly expect that their turn would come. But it was the ingrained opinion of the people of Canada that the five years administration of hon. gentlemen opposite were five years of misfortune, disaster and incapacity of every kind. Notwithstanding all our faults, all our shortcomings, all our errors, they thought it better to keep us, after eight years of mismanagement, according to the statement of these hon. gentlemen, and to give us a commission to misgovern the country for five years more. I said I would challenge the hon. gentlemen to say whether they did not expect to carry the country beyond a doubt. That belief existed after the 22nd day of February, and it existed especially in the mind of the hon. leader of the Opposition. You may remember that on the night of the 22nd it was pretty well known that we had a majority; but the North-West and Manitoba elections were still to come on, and so the Grit press, with that energy and accuracy which distinguish them, telegraphed all over the west that the Tories were down, the reign of corruption had ended, and the party of purity had carried the country by a majority of eight. They have a Grit party, or the nucleus of one, in the town of Victoria, in British Columbia; and they, believing these telegrams—and it was a wonder that the Grits, knowing what their press was, did believe them—telegraphed to the hon. leader of the Opposition their hearty congratulations on his glorious victory. That telegram, according to its date, left Victoria at 2:37 the next day, the 23rd of February. By that time I think it was pretty well known that this majority of eight was rather mythical than otherwise; but on the 24th, two days after the election, the hon. leader of the Opposition telegraphed: "Thanks for your congratulations; work with all your heart and complete the victory." So that two days after hon. gentlemen opposite had been beaten, horse, foot and artillery, such was the impression upon their minds that they would not believe the plainest facts, and they still believed that they had carried the country, and that the reign of corruption was over. These are the exact words of the telegram:—

Mr. McMULLEN. How did you get it?