

my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture—his published official statements—are utterly unreliable. And what more does he venture to say of a man who, he knows, stands as high as a man of honor and character in this House as any man that can be found in the wide domain of Canada? He uses the term in reference to the conduct of that gentleman—“deliberate and fraudulent intent.” What shall be said of a man who ventures to use such language as that, of any hon. gentleman of this House, and especially by a man who has such a record as the hon. gentleman himself? What shall be said of a man who applies to a Minister of the Crown, my right hon. friend who sits beside me (Sir John A. Macdonald), such language as that he was “insolent and unscrupulous,” or applies to him the term “deserved ignominy?” He said that the right hon. gentleman was driven from power in deserved ignominy.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no man in this House who should blush more to make such a statement than the hon. gentleman. What did he do? He spent five long years standing in the position of a Minister of the Crown, denouncing my right hon. friend in the foulest and most unworthy terms that our language supplies. He went from platform to platform outside of this House, and fairly out-Heroded Herod in relation to the language he used inside the House; and with what result? With the result that when the great electorate—the great, independent, intelligent electorate of Canada—were called upon to decide between my right hon. friend and the man who traduced him, they consigned one to the ignominy which he deserved, and gave to the other the highest and proudest position that a Prime Minister of Canada ever occupied. If the hon. gentleman was capable of learning anything—which I regret to say, I find he is too obtuse to do—he would have learned that his declarations of opinion are utterly discredited by the people of Canada. He would have learned, Sir, that he had it thrown back in his teeth that all the foul language he had used had recoiled upon his own head, and that he had sunk, while my hon. friend had become elevated to the proud position he now occupies. If only for its uselessness, one would suppose that he would have learned by this time the folly of giving vent to such utterances. The hon. gentleman says—and it is a very striking illustration of the bent of his mind—that it may be all very well for the Minister of Finance to place under obligation these millionaires, that the money may be found very convenient at times of a general election. That shows the bent of the hon. gentleman's mind. Suppose, Sir, that my hon. friend had stood convicted, as that hon. gentleman stands convicted—and I use the term again advisedly—of having in the teeth of the statute abused his position in the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs, by taking surreptitiously from the public Treasury \$59,000 before a general election, and giving it to a great corporation. Is it any wonder, Sir, that men should come to the conclusion that Ministers of the Crown may forget the high position they occupy to such an extent as to become the beneficiaries—not to the tune of \$5,000,000 to friends abroad, but here in Canada, to lay a great corporation under the obligation of having received, in the teeth of the statute, \$59,000 of public money. Now, Sir, I am glad that the painful task of showing that hon. gentleman what my hon. friend has not done—what his record is not—is ended, and that the insult, the gross, unpardonable insult flung across the House by the hon. gentleman, was as undeserved as it was gratuitous; and, Sir, I will now pass on to notice a few more of the very remarkable observations made by the hon. gentleman in reply to my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman, with his very stilted phraseology, and his wheeling around and throwing himself into a great variety of attitudes, brought to my recollection a circumstance that occurred on the

occasion of his first Budget Speech. I confess that the hon. gentleman has improved a little in his style of public address since then. There were some comments in the lobby on that occasion; and, as you will remember, the hon. gentleman was not only very stilted, but very mechanical; and one gentleman said to another in the lobby: “He seemed to bounce around and jerk around like one of Mitchell's revolving lighthouses.” “Yes,” said the other, “but without the light.” When I saw the hon. gentleman wheeling around to his supporters, it reminded me of that occasion; and when I tried to follow him, I saw that the hon. gentleman had no argument to address to the House, and I found that it was the revolving lighthouse without the light. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in the outset, took my hon. friend to task for want of economy in preparing his estimates. Want of economy in preparing his estimates! What did the hon. gentleman mean? Does he forget that the estimated expenditures of the first year that he was Finance Minister are now recorded on the public records of this country, and that he asked this Parliament to vote no less than \$26,600,000? And yet, in the year 1882, he wants to know why his economy was not followed. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman asked for no less than \$1,300,000 more than the largest expenditure that Canada had ever had. I know that the Public Accounts state that the expenditure of 1873-74 was \$23,316,316; but it is not true. That is the statement in which the hon. gentleman forced the balance. That is the statement which contains half a million of money, transferred by the hon. gentleman's right hand from capital account to the charges on revenue, contrary to the manner in which it was voted by Parliament, for the purpose of swelling the balance and making the excuse for his statement that there would be a deficit on the first of the following July. And that matter, Sir, stands on record, under the pen of one of the officers in the hon. gentleman's own Department, the accountant. And what else? There are \$59,000 of Customs refunds of the former year, and, if that had been an honest charge, it could not have gone in there as an expenditure of that year, which the hon. gentleman knows right well. It was a statement of an amount of money drawn in the teeth of the statute out of the Treasury of Canada, and handed over to a wealthy corporation on the eve of an election, and the hon. gentleman seems to understand all the weight and importance of such a transaction as that. Well, Sir, the next fault he has to find with my hon. friend, is this—he wants to know if being two or three million dollars astray in the estimated revenue he is to receive is not evidence of the want of ability in the hon. the Finance Minister. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says my hon. friend took a leap in the dark. Well, he came out the right side up. The hon. gentleman took a leap in the dark, but he came out in the ditch—that is the difference. My hon. friend knows that it would be impossible—not in the case of an ordinary change, but in a revolution in the Tariff, such as was the change my hon. friend made—to estimate exactly what he would receive. But he came out with the balance on the right side—he came out with a surplus. The hon. gentleman took his leap in the dark, and he came out, at the end of three years, with a deficit of \$7,500,000. That is the difference. The hon. gentleman talks about leaps in the dark. Why, the hon. gentleman, with the Tariff, and with the Trade Returns in his hands, and with the experience of the past, brought down his Estimates here—and what were they? His estimated expenditure was \$26,600,000, and he was only \$2,987,000 astray. The hon. gentleman declared that he would receive from that Tariff of his own concoction \$25,250,000, and he received \$22,507,000, or \$2,642,000 less. And yet he stands up here, with the brazen shield as usual, and taunts my hon. friend with errors in his estimate, and with having got more money by his leap in the dark than he expected. The hon. gentleman's next charge is that the