

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.—Sir John Rose was acting for this country.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON —When the Finance Minister goes to England, he supersedes every other agent, and I have no doubt Sir John Rose and Messrs. Glyn & Baring represented themselves and their English clients.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Sir John Rose acted on the part of Canada.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON — We should have the names of the allottees and allotments, and all the facts relating to the matter. With respect to the Independence of Parliament measure, which, we are told, will be submitted to us, I will only say that what has been brought to light has brought discredit and reproach upon parliamentary institutions, and I hope an Independence of Parliament Act will be devised by the hon. gentlemen which will keep their friends pure.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—And their opponents.

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON—Yes, and their opponents too. With respect to the system of auditing the Public Accounts, there is, no doubt, room for very great improvement, and probably one of the things most necessary is that a uniform system should be observed—uniform year after year. That is very frequently departed from, and is exceedingly inconvenient for those who take some pains to look through the Public Accounts. For instance, in 1876, the details of Customs expenditures were given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, instead of in the Public Accounts, as was formerly the case. In looking at those details, I see that the Customs Revenue in Montreal, in 1876, fell off \$1,570,416, while the cost of collecting it increased \$17,452. Will hon. gentlemen explain how that was? It is perfectly impossible that the increased expenditure could have been necessary in the public interest. Then I find among the new items wages to lockers and extra clerks, \$12,465; extra services at Examining Warehouse, \$5,735. Now those were extraordinary additions to that branch of the service in 1876, in the face of a falling off in the Revenue of \$1,500,000. Then there is an item for cartage, &c., at the Examining Warehouse.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.—I presume that is added to the Customs by the parties whose goods were transported to the warehouse.

Hon. Mr. Macpherson,

Hon. Mr. MACPHERSON.—All these details which used to be in the Public Accounts are, for 1876, in the Trade and Navigation Returns. Why was the change made? Then there is a paragraph relating to the temperance question. Whatever that measure may be, I hope it will be one in consonance with the public sentiment of the country. The only other thing which I will notice in respect to the Speech from the Throne is an omission. I am not over strict, but I regretted missing from the Speech what I do not recollect having missed from the Speech from the Throne on any other occasion, I mean an invocation of the Divine blessing upon the labors of Parliament. That is an omission which I think is to be regretted. I shall not take up the time of the House any longer, I regret that I was obliged to speak on the Address, but the Government and their friends rendered it necessary for me to do so.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—I cordially share in the congratulations that have been expressed in the tone and manner of the mover and seconder of the Address, on answer to the Speech from the Throne. Since these hon. gentlemen delivered themselves yesterday, the debate has taken a wide range, and, as it appears to me, somewhat irregularly, the question of freetrade has been interjected into the discussion. Irregular and inconvenient it is; but certainly the Government cannot complain of that, since it was in consequence of the dissertation on freetrade with which we were favored by the hon. Secretary of State that this question arose, and gave rise to the criticisms of my hon. friends from Woodstock and Sunbury, and these criticisms have not yet been answered.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It was not I who started the debate on freetrade.

Hon. Mr. DICKEY—Allusion was made by the leader of the Opposition to the question of protection in connection with the commercial depression. It was quite legitimate, but it was wholly incidental, and certainly did not afford ground for the position taken by the hon. Secretary of State, unless it was his desire to get up this debate, which was perfectly legitimate and proper if he desired so to do. But if he had not taken the course which he did, our labors would have been