

observations he had made. The leader of the House had said the word "indecent" was unparliamentary; he (Hon. Mr. Holton) joined issue it was a word used not unfrequently in Parliament, and was often used by Sir John A. Macdonald himself; and that gentleman sometimes used a stronger word in respect to his opponents, the word "dishonest".

Mr. Howe had never been charged in a former debate with having delivered a speech, the whole drift of which went to show that connection between this country and the Empire could not be maintained, because of two master grievances: the first was the withdrawal of troops; the second was that England had recently bartered away the interests of Canada in the Treaty of Washington. What he (Hon. Mr. Holton) meant to say was, that for Hon. Mr. Howe as a Minister of the Crown, to propose a severance from England on those grounds, was indecent. He (Hon. Mr. Holton) did not apply the word in an offensive sense to the person of Mr. Howe, but intended by it to characterize his political conduct in as strong terms as he could use. He repeated that the Ministers, by continuing to occupy the same benches with Hon. Mr. Howe, assumed the responsibility of his utterances, for a Minister could never separate himself from his quality in respect to a public question. He would observe, in conclusion, that Hon. Mr. Howe had used language not fit for utterance in the company of gentlemen.

Hon. Mr. BLAKE said that the speech to which the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) had referred had been reported substantially correctly, and he was prepared to abide by it. What he had desired to say in his former remarks was that if it was true that England had recently tried to barter away Canadian interests for her own benefit, and that Cabinet Ministers in England were acting in a manner that involved the separation of the country, then this country was at a serious and appalling juncture.

Mr. WORKMAN had agreed to second the motion of the member for Hamilton (Mr. Magill), that he might have an opportunity to examine the evidence brought before the Committee; at the same time he desired distinctly to state that he was not in favor of a high protective duty. Some branches of manufacture were not sufficiently protected, but the country was thoroughly prosperous, and if these branches could be protected, the prosperity would continue.

As to the other subject that had been introduced into the discussion, he happened to be in New York when the lecture in question was delivered, and had been accosted on the subject on the Exchange there by parties who said that a Cabinet minister at Ottawa openly advocated annexation. He had denied this, but had afterwards read the lecture with great regret because the previous life and action of the hon. lecturer had evinced a much higher tone of loyalty. He had, however, listened with great pleasure to the utterances of the Premier, because they had convinced him that the Cabinet were not in favour of a change in the connection with England. He wished to live and die under the old flag.

Mr. YOUNG thought the Government ought themselves to have

a policy on the question and should not delegate the matter to a Committee, although he said there might be some excuse for the proceeding as the Government seemed utterly unable to frame a commercial policy. He referred to changes in the tariff which had been made in almost every session, dwelling on the proceedings in the session of 1869, terming the action of the Minister of Finance at that time (Sir John Rose) a somersault. With regard to the duty on grain and flour, he maintained that the farmers did not want any such absurd duty, as they know that it would be no advantage to them and a great injury to other interests of the Dominion. Everyone would admit that it would be a great benefit to encourage manufactures, but other interests should not be forgotten, and he trusted that the Committee would remember that they were acting for the whole community and not for any particular portion.

Mr. MAGILL said that the practice of appointing Committees on such matters had been called in question, but he maintained that it was in accordance with British practice and quoted from Mr. Todd's Parliamentary Practice in support of his statement. With regard to the amendment he considered that the Committee as he had asked for it would have quite enough work on its hands and he could not consent therefore to the agricultural interests being also submitted to it.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS replied to the remarks of the member for Waterloo (Mr. Young) as to the changes in the tariff. He explained the reasons that had induced the Government to change its policy in 1870, and said that in 1871 they would have been quite prepared to take off the duties on the articles in question as far as revenue was concerned, and had only hesitated to do so on account of the negotiations then pending at Washington.

Hon. Mr. ANGLIN spoke on the same points, attributing the sudden change in the tariff to the pressure brought to bear on them by a gentleman now in the Cabinet who had threatened the Ministry with the opposition of the whole of Nova Scotia if they did not accede to his request.

Mr. BODWELL said the agricultural interests of the country did not require any system of protection. He accused the member for Hamilton (Mr. Magill) of having formerly advocated the interests of the farming population, and now, when it suited his own interests casting them off, by refusing to consent to their interests being considered by the committee for which he had moved. He hoped the amendment would not be withdrawn.

Mr. JONES (Leeds North and Grenville North) regretted very much that the member for Hamilton (Mr. Magill) objected to his amendment, but of course he could only withdraw it and move for a separate committee at another time.

The main motion was then carried.

* * *

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the Report of the Committee appointed to prepare Standing Committees.