

in the mind of a man who was then so eager to have a motion of this kind proposed, and who now refuses to propose such a motion? I believe the hon. gentleman is unchanged in his adherence to the principle of Home Rule, though he has lost his courage. I hope matters will be so arranged that we will have a full, free and untrammelled discussion of the proposition we have before us on a subsequent and early day. There is need for haste, even although the Bill should not come up in the English House of Commons until the 10th, as the Premier says. We cannot expect that a resolution of this kind will take effect immediately; there should be some time for it to sink into the minds of the English House of Commons, and affect them, as we hope it will, and, therefore, the day on which we are to discuss this question should be as early as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say to remove any misapprehension that my proposition was a plain and simple one, and it was this, that if this motion was withdrawn we would give the hon. gentleman an early opportunity—any day after to-morrow he chooses—to move it as a substantive motion.

M. BLAKE. I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that. I understood the hon. gentleman's only objection to be the fact that he had not notice. I naturally supposed after his making a statement of the kind he has made here, after his making it in that clear manner, that this motion should be moved in the same manner and under the same circumstances in which the motion was made in 1882, with his approval and consent and in the same manner and circumstances under which he moved his motion on the grave constitutional question in the Letellier case on going into Supply, with the object which the hon. gentleman clearly stated in answer to the hon. member for East York, as a reason why it was preferable to take that course. My hon. friend from Elgin has read the First Minister's statement of those reasons which he smiles at now, though he then thought, and I still think, they were very good and fair reasons. I could hardly have supposed, having regard to these two important precedents, the one of the hon. gentleman himself when leader of the Opposition, and the other of the hon. member for Victoria, the Minister of Inland Revenue, under his auspices and with his assent as the leader of the Government, that he was objecting to the same form of discussion in the same circumstances. I certainly understood him to be proposing that I should have the same opportunity as I have to-night, on Thursday or on any day but Wednesday. It now turns out that there was a misunderstanding and that the hon. gentleman's proposal was that this motion should be exposed to the perils which he described so graphically on the occasion of his refusal to submit his motion to similar perils in the Letellier case. I am placed therefore in an awkward position, having, as I say, a very great deal of respect for the reasons and the views he then pressed. But I have to add to the consideration of the case the magnitude of this cause, the great importance of it and the earnest desire which I entertain that that result will be accomplished which the Minister of Inland Revenue foreshadowed as possible, of obtaining a unanimous vote, and that cause being dearer to me than any other thing, I am determined to encounter all those risks and disasters, and therefore I accept the hon. gentleman's proposal, and with the leave of the House, will withdraw my motion, on the understanding that it stands as a notice of motion, to be the first notice for Thursday, the day the hon. gentleman fixed; and I add to that, in response to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and to the suggestion rather than the statement of the First Minister, that if there be any opportunity in the meantime to accommodate members with reference to the form of expression of that motion, I shall be only too glad to facilitate such a happy result.

Mr. CASEY,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken my advice in the matter, and has agreed to withdraw his motion. But I do not like the hon. gentleman. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not gather from me that I desired that it should be withdrawn for the purpose of its being made a substantive motion, for if I did not use plain words on that occasion then I never used plain words. I used the word substantive, and I said if the hon. gentleman will move it any day he likes, or give notice, or will accept notice now—for that purpose I will agree as leader of the Government to set aside every Government measure; and if that is so, he could not move it on going into Supply.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If it is not out of order I wish to say a few words. Whatever difference of opinion may exist between the hon. gentleman and myself, I feel much pleased that he has taken this course, as I think it is the wisest course and one calculated to bring about, if possible, a solution of this question. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken the course he has.

Mr. BLAKE. - I suppose that on the adjournment the hon. gentleman will make a motion that this shall stand as the first order on Thursday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Amendment withdrawn.

TIMBER LICENSES, &c., IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you leave the Chair I desire to place in your hands a resolution expressing regret that the independence of this Parliament has been impaired by the conduct of the Government in various respects, in its administration of the public trusts of this country. A government, Sir, under free institutions, rules by the consent of the governed. The members of the administration of a country are the stewards of the people, and as stewards should discharge their trust with an eye to the interest of the whole body of the people. As agents they are not entitled to embezzle or misappropriate the public funds or public property, but they are bound to conserve the interests of their principals, and administer their trusts honestly, and in the interest of the people. For instance, the duty of a government with regard to levying taxes is to require from the people, the payment of so much money as may be necessary for the economical and efficient administration of the public affairs of the country. When this limit is exceeded and when larger sums are wrung from the people in the form of taxation, and the money so paid by the people is expended recklessly, extravagantly or corruptly, then the government fails to discharge its duty as the public steward, and is guilty of an act that should receive the condemnation of the people. So, Sir, with regard to public property, the government is the custodian of a great variety of interests. The Government of this country, in addition to its functions in levying taxes, is in possession of a great public domain. It administers the landed estates of this nation, one of the greatest public domains possessed by any people in the world, it administers the timber domains of this country; and these various trusts which are entrusted to the care of the Government, should be dealt with by it in a spirit of honesty, in a spirit designed to secure the advantage, not of favorites or friends of the Government, but the advantage of the whole people to whom this property belongs, and for whom the Government is administering it. The stewards who embezzle for their own benefit, and in their own behalf, the public property, will not be likely to raise objections to the embezzlement of public property by others. If a member of Parliament accepts for himself an unjust advantage, the cost of that unjust advantage in his own case is a loss to the