

wealth of the country allowed of its being built. As to the measures that were to be submitted to that House for its consideration, there was one upon which legislation was necessary, but which had been omitted, a law to provide against corruption at elections. He regretted that such a law was not passed before the last election. He hoped before long to see such a law as would bring public men on each side to see it to be their duty to prevent every kind of abuse of the franchise and the use of money at elections. As to the establishment of a Court of Appeals, he thought it highly necessary. In conclusion he had only to say, that he would try to co-operate with those who had the power in their hands to enable them to carry on such legislation as would be beneficial to the country. He would not show any factious opposition. That he believed was well known to his friends on his side of the House, but he would try to help even the present Government. At all events he would offer no opposition, and with these observations he would take his seat, merely remarking that he had been driven against his will to make the observations that had fallen from him.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL made some observations to show the material prosperity of the country under the present administration.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said he did not rise for the purpose of taking any part in the debate, but he thought the House would scarcely expect him to pass by in silence the remarks that had been made on the Oaths Bill. It was natural that his friend should feel some little irritation when he found it proved that he was wrong in his opinion by the highest authority in England. He (Mr. Dickey) claimed no credit because he was right in the view he took. He might have let the matter pass had it not been said that it was a power that was inherent in the Houses of Parliament. Now it was a well known fact that in England as well as here, neither House had any such power until 1871, when it was given them by Act of Parliament; but it was not an inherent power.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER DE ST. JUST— They had the power of legislation.

Hon. Mr DICKEY said that was arguing within a circle. It was not fair to reflect in an indirect manner upon any person because the result of what his friend announced to the House as a lawyer turned out to be contrary to the highest authority in the Empire. In all

cases of that kind, it would be well to speak with reserve and hesitation. His friend was wrong, but no doubt he did it with the best intention, and it did not detract from his high standing when it turned out that he was wrong in this instance.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON said he could not allow the debate to close without congratulating the House and the country on the surrender of the Pacific Railway Charter. If the course he had felt it his duty to pursue last session had contributed in any degree to bring about that result, he honestly believed he had there rendered the country good service. He believed the failure of that scheme would be for the advantage of the whole Dominion, including the distant Province of British Columbia, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built earlier in consequence of the failure of the company and the surrender of the charter. The only return the country could derive from all that was injurious and deplorable that transpired during the last few months, was the failure of the arrangement made with the Pacific Railway Company, and surrender of its charter. When the measure for constructing the railway, promised by the Government, was submitted to the Senate, he (Mr. Macpherson) would be prepared to take a part in discussing it. He would be in favor of constructing the railway as a public work, just as rapidly as the public interests might demand, and the finances of the country would permit. Before concluding he must thank his hon. friend, the member for Grandville, (Hon. Mr. Letellier de St. Just) for his kind expressions.

Hon. Mr. CHRISTIE said he did not intend moving any amendment to the address in answer to the speech from the Throne, but desired to congratulate his honorable friends who had moved and seconded the answer. The mover's speech was characterized with great moderation, and he referred to certain passages in the speech in a very appropriate way, but as this was the most important crisis that the country had ever passed through, he thought the mover might have referred at some length to the second and third paragraphs in the speech. No doubt he thought that was better omitted, from his point of view. Still he (Mr Christie) could not allow the occasion to pass without recording his solemn conviction that this was the most solemn trial through which the country had ever passed. The question that was involved in this crisis was that of the good government of the country, and of purity of administra-