

eration. He knew that he brought his whole strength and the strength of his party to bear in doing a simple act of justice to the people of Ontario, and they would have been glad to have seen him receive the same recognition of his services as was extended to the honourable leader of the Government. He thought the House was entitled to these papers. With the correspondence before them, members would be able to judge more correctly of the motives of the Imperial Government, and he saw no reason why the motion should not be granted.

Mr. Parker felt that there was no public man in the country to whom they were more indebted than to the Minister of Militia, (Hon. Mr. Cartier). There was no public man who had so greatly jeopardized his position in accomplishing Confederation, and he was entitled to the very highest honour that could properly be conferred. Whoever was responsible, an invidious distinction has been made.

Hon. John Hillyard Cameron said that if any representation were made by this Government in regard to these honours, the House had a right to have them; but the question was, were any such representations made? If not, it would be a bad precedent in view of the decisions of the Imperial Parliament in similar cases, to grant the motion. He also paid a high tribute to the services of Mr. Cartier.

Mr. Morris said there was a class of hereditary distinctions not adapted to the circumstances of this country; but there was another class awarded for distinguished services which might be fairly conferred on public men in this Dominion; but he considered the leader of the Government right in stating that it would be a great inconvenience should this motion be adopted. The principle which controlled this question was that the Crown was the fountain of honour, and the position taken in England was that this question would lead to the canvassing of individual members, and that thereby great difficulties would be caused. But while he said this, he thought that if there was one man more than another entitled to a recognition of his services, it was the Minister of Militia.

Mr. Dunkin was not satisfied with the reasons given by the Minister of Justice for the motion not passing. The proposition that we had nothing to do with the matter was erroneous. The word colonies applies to us no longer. We have been told that we are a nationality, and that we have adopted a word

[Mr. Mackenzie (Lambton)]

almost signifying as much, and without doing so exactly—that we had a Parliament, that the Queen was head of that Parliament, and whatever the Queen does in public matters unless prejudicial to the public interests, was something into which we have a right to inquire. As regards the Minister of Militia, strongly as he had been opposed to him on the question of Confederation, he could bear testimony to the valuable services he had rendered.

Sir John A. Macdonald agreed that if any representations had been made by our Government to the Imperial Government, and any honours were conferred in consequence of such representations Ministers were responsible for them; but there were no such representations. The honours were conferred without any previous notice—therefore, the only object of this motion would be to ascertain by whose advice these honours were conferred. But colonial ministers or the members of the Imperial Government were not responsible to this House. This Government in fact possessed no papers—those referred to having been sent to the Imperial Government. No one knew better than he did the distinguished services the Minister of Militia had rendered—and he (John A.) had no hesitation in saying that the proffered honour was wholly inadequate to the great services of that gentleman; and he could say further what was perhaps not generally known, that long ago that honourable gentleman could have obtained, and was in the way of obtaining, honours, not only of this, but of the hereditary class spoken of.

Mr. Holton thought that the real point raised by this motion had been lost sight of. Nobody proposed to censure the Imperial authorities—nobody proposed to call in question the action of the Crown itself in conferring honours on any of the subjects of the Crown, but what was proposed, as he took it, was to call in question the action of the prominent public men of this country—members of this house. In this matter they were not groping in the dark. As he said before, they know that two honourable gentlemen—the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Finance, did address formal remonstrances to the Imperial authorities. On this very subject if they mistook their position—if it were an improper thing to address such remonstrances to the Crown, surely they were responsible, and the House was entitled to know the reception these remonstrances received from the responsible advisers of the Crown in England.