

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE St JUST—They are so represented by the press supporting the Government.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON expressed regret that the hon. gentleman should have brought the matter up; the time would come when he would be obliged to deal with it at length.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD supported the position taken by the Postmaster-General as strictly in accordance with Parliamentary practice. However, he had been much struck with the authorities quoted by the hon. gentleman opposite. It certainly seemed useless to allow such motions to be made when no results were to accrue from them. However, he hoped the Postmaster-General would accede to the request of the hon. gentleman and allow the consideration of the address to be deferred until Monday.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL said that he had no doubt the Postmaster-General would have acceded to a simple request for delay until Monday, but when that request was based upon a fallacious reason it was only right to refuse it. It was quite clear that the House would not have more information before it by Monday. The House was not asked to enter upon the merits of any of the measures mentioned in the speech, but simply to thank His Excellency for having given it information that certain questions would be submitted to the consideration of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that he was quite ready to accede to the request of the gentlemen opposite and move for the discharge of the order of the day, though he did not see anything would be gained by the delay.

Hon. Mr. BENSON would like to see the papers with respect to the Welland Canal mentioned in the speech.

After a few remarks from Hon. Mr. BUREAU and others, Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the hon. gentlemen knew perfectly well that they could not get, and that they did not wish any papers at present.

The order of the day was discharged, and the address ordered to be taken up on Monday next.

#### RETURN.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL laid on the table a return showing a certain increase in salaries of officers of the House made during the recess, by a committee appointed to deal with the question at the end of the last session.

#### EXPLANATIONS.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said; I think

that this is the proper time to refer to a personal matter, since my name has been mentioned more than once since this discussion commenced. I do not intend entering upon private matters, for I know they are distasteful to everybody and to no one more than to myself. I prefer, however, making the very few remarks I feel compelled to make at the present moment rather than on the occasion of the debate on the address. A very coarse attack has been made upon me. The *Montreal Gazette*, as it is well known, is not owned by a private individual or a joint stock company, as other newspapers, but it is the property almost exclusively of Sir Hugh Allan. He is just as much responsible for all that appears in that newspaper, for all the errors of the editor, as he is liable to suffer by the mistakes of his book-keeper. It is quite probable, had he been home, that attack upon me would not have appeared, at all events his editor would have been more fully informed with respect to the matters referred to in that article. However, Sir Hugh Allan must be held responsible, for the paper is his property; it is bound to consult his wishes and promote his interests. The best reply can be found in the fact that Sir Hugh Allan sought my co-operation more than a year ago in carrying on this great enterprise. Had I been such a person as I am described by his organ, it is hardly likely that he would have sought my assistance so earnestly. I have been compelled to decline that co-operation after understanding this scheme in all its bearings. I looked upon it more as a conspiracy against the county than as a scheme for constructing the Pacific Railway. I looked upon it as a scheme by which the great interests of Canada would be transferred to foreigners and rivals. I regretted very much that it was so. I did all I could to prevent it, but I was not successful. Therefore I had no recourse but to decline co-operation and do all I could to prevent the scheme being carried out. Could I have given that co-operation I would not have been made the subject of an attack in the organ of this gentleman. I hold still the same opinion with respect to this scheme. I regret very much to be compelled to touch upon the matter of the Pacific Railway now, for I intend bringing it forward in the shape of a substantive motion at a future day. It is very distasteful to me to resent the gross attack made upon me. Sir Hugh Allan and I have been known to each other for upwards of 35 years—we have a good many mutual friends and acquaintances. I do not say too much when I state that whilst