

House. Here was the fixed policy of the Government enunciated in the most solemn manner by a speech from the Throne, sums of money for the purpose being twice included in the estimates, and yet after a few words from the hon. member for South Bruce, away goes the speech of the GOVERNOR GENERAL and the items in the estimates, and the First Minister forthwith reduces the item of \$1,000,000 down to \$20,000 which was clearly to be the first and last expenditure on this unfortunate Baie Verte Canal project. The hon. member for Cumberland was only anxious to secure the construction of this great national work, which was so regarded even by the hon. member for South Bruce, and it was the hon. member's duty to be so in the interest of his constituency. The hon. member for Cumberland could not be charged with having used unparliamentary language, because he had not charged the hon. member for South Bruce with personal corruption or personal immorality, for he thought that the argument of the hon. member for South Bruce led in that direction. Even in the British Parliament, hon. members would not hesitate to use such language in regard to arguments. He (Sir JOHN MACDONALD) had heard the speech of the hon. the First Minister, with much regret. The hon. the First Minister had charged the hon. member for Cumberland with having placed in the estimates, for political purposes, amounts for the construction of the Baie Verte Canal, and with having been a reckless administrator. It was well known that the Baie Verte Canal was a question which interested Nova Scotia and New Brunswick before Confederation, repeated surveys having been made. When the late Government prepared a canal extension scheme, they did not come before Parliament in the reckless manner adopted by the present Government; but they appointed a Canal Commission composed of engineers and commercial men which included Colonel GZOWSKI, Sir HUGH ALLAN, Mr. CALVIN and Mr. GEORGE LAIDLAW. The hon. gentleman said there was but one decent man in the whole lot. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not remember that Mr. SAMUEL KEEFER was Secretary to the Commission, and that he was employed to work up the whole subject and make a report. He (Sir JOHN)

thought there was no one in this House or out of it who would disparage the position and standing of Mr. KEEFER, who was an engineer of first-rate standing and eminence.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Why was he dismissed? Why was he removed from the Department of Public Works, under the right hon. gentleman's administration?

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said it was because he did not agree with Mr. KILLALY—because there were two powers in the Department which would not work together.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE—Mr. KILLALY was not there at that time.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the commission, at any rate, made an admirable report, and upon the main features of it the First Minister was now carrying out his policy with regard to all the canals except the Baie Verte. After Mr. BAILLAIRGE had been engaged on the work some years, Mr. KEEFER and Mr. GZOWSKI went over the ground, and Mr. KEEFER made a report which the Government accepted. A sum was put in the estimates to meet the cost of construction, and the work would have been proceeded with at once, but at the urgent request of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it was postponed.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE inquired whether, before the Right hon. member for Kingston left office, Mr PAGE was not instructed to make another report.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the Government had been induced to ask for a second report on account of the pressure brought to bear upon them by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Hon. Mr. SMITH said the pressure amounted to this—that the hon. member for Cumberland was having the terminus fixed in his own county, instead of the county of Westmoreland.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD said the hon. member for Cumberland was then and continued to be anxious for the welfare of the whole Dominion, and of the Maritime Provinces, and for this reason it would have been justifiable had he contended for having the terminus where he thought it best in the interest of the country. He (Sir JOHN) exceedingly regretted that the First Minister had used language with regard to the member for