

the Pacific Railway in the direction of Port Arthur, there are nearly 7,000 French Canadians, and the hon. gentleman must know that in no season during the last ten years have farm labourers been so scarce as they were last season. Under these circumstances, we can understand the difficulty of obtaining labourers to complete the railway in the North-West. I think the hon. gentleman ought to have posted himself on that question before attempting to enlighten the House upon it. Now, Sir, I propose to allude briefly to the position taken by the hon. member for South Huron upon the financial question. Every speech that the hon. gentleman has made in this House he has prefaced with attacks of the most outrageous character on the present leader of the Government; and I was surprised, that you, Sir, who are so distinguished for fair play and impartiality, should have allowed these infamous attacks on the oldest political leader in this Dominion. I say that nothing will justify the shameful language that hon. gentleman used towards the leader of the Government. In 1873 he went to the polls condemning the right hon. gentleman. He went again in 1878 holding him up as one of the greatest villains this country ever produced; but the country told him: you have foully maligned that man, and we are prepared to follow him. The dose was repeated two years ago, and I say that hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to repeat those expressions with reference to a gentleman who is entitled to the respect and esteem of every man on this continent. That hon. gentleman declared in this House the other day, that the expenditure had increased during six years to the extent of \$10,000,000. Sir, that assertion was well met by the hon. gentleman who followed him. But I want to send out to the public, side by side with that speech of the hon. gentleman, a speech he delivered a few years ago, which will show what kind of a man we have to deal with. It is true the people thought they had sent him to oblivion a few years ago, but by the grace of Mr. McMillan he sits here again. Now, Sir, if he has any shame at all, I will give him an opportunity of showing it. We have heard of the silver shield, and I asked him the other night while he was making his speech which side of the shield he showed this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite must know that they have among them, as one of their leaders, a renegade from the Conservative party, and they must feel ashamed of his speeches in Parliament. The hon. gentleman's language is:

"I say that hon. gentlemen who support a Finance Minister, who in six years, from 1867 to 1874, added \$10,000,000 a year to the annual expenditure, and left a further liability of \$60,000,000, and who has since added \$8,000,000 to the annual expenditure, should know well what great risks the country runs from such insane expenditures."

When the hon. member denounces in Parliament, the Government, he ought to recollect that, in the year 1872, before he knew whether his talent would be appreciated by the Reform party or not—when he was standing between heaven and earth, as it were, awaiting to see what party would take his wares—he then placed on record his views with regard to the right hon. the leader of the Government. He said: "I am prepared to place in his hands the expenditure of \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land; I am prepared to take his word for it; I have entire confidence in him," yet to-day he has the audacity to stand up here and criticise the hon. gentleman in unmeasured terms. Upon that occasion, a resolution was moved by Mr. Woods and seconded by Mr. Mills, as follows:—

"That all the words after 'be' to the end of the question be left out and the words, recommended to a Committee of the Whole House, in order to amend the same, so that so large a sum as \$30,000,000 of money and so large a quantity of land as 50,000,000 of acres shall not be at the disposition of the will of the Government of the day, and so that the said money and lands shall only be disposed of by specific annual votes of Parliament, from time to time given, as shall seem to appear right and proper, so that Parliament shall not be divested of its most important constitutional function, namely, control over the public expenditure of the country, inserted instead thereof."

Mr. RYKERT.

He had that much confidence in the right hon. gentleman that he was prepared to trust him with the control of \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres, yet to-day he has the audacity to say that that hon. gentleman committed an infamous act and was unworthy the confidence of the people. I was referring to the statement made that the expenses had increased \$10,000,000 from 1867 to 1873, and that it was due to the reckless management of the Government of that day. But what did the hon. gentleman say with reference to that increased expenditure. He said, when Minister of Finance, in his circular, which he sent to the English stock market:

"The whole of the debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. There has been expended on:

Canals, about.....	£ 5,500,000
Railways, including advances to and the cost of those actually owned by Canada.....	12,000,000
Lighthouses, river improvements, harbours, roads and public buildings.....	2,000,000
Compensation to the various Provinces for property and revenue surrendered to the Dominion, the purchase and organization of territories, and the freeing of lands in the Province of Quebec from the feudal tenure &c.....	5,000,000

He then goes on to say:

"The revenue has shown a continuous surplus during each year since the Confederation in 1867, although it has in the interval been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition or organization of new territories, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion. The eight years since Confederation, therefore, exhibit an aggregate surplus of £2,448,111 (not including the Sinking Fund), which has been partially applied in the redemption of debt and partially expended on new works."

That was the circular of the hon. gentleman in England, but what did he do when he came out here? He made a speech a short time afterwards at Alymer, on the 22nd of September, where he forgot all his references to the bright side of the picture, and presented instead this dismal view:—

"Sir, I have asked myself more than once, and I now publicly repeat the question: was this done in sheer brutal ignorance and recklessness? or was it done of malice prepense? Did they design to scuttle the ship after they had plundered it? or was it only the last mad folly of the drunken crew before they had ran upon the breakers? Whatever the cause, that was the position of affairs when we came into office; those were the difficulties to which you have alluded in your address, and with which my hon. friend has been struggling ever since. Now there is no doubt the position was a critical one."

He was then referring to the \$10,000,000 of increased expenditure from 1867 to 1873, which he had formerly characterized as having been expended in public works of great utility to the country, but which expenditure he now characterized as the last act of a drunken crew. Let us see what was the estimate formed of that hon. gentleman by his own friends. We have been compelled upon different occasions to listen to quotations from that side of the House taken from a very distinguished writer in this country, a writer of current events in the *Bystander*. If ever there was a member of this House properly gauged and a proper estimate of his character formed, that was done with reference to the hon. gentleman by that writer, who has so often had occasion to write about different members of this House and the other Parliament. I can point to nothing that, to my mind, more conclusively shows the real position that the hon. gentleman occupies in the estimation of his countrymen. *Bystander* says:

"Perhaps the recent political history of Canada has never been so boldly travestied by one as intelligent audience as the Finance Minister attempted to travesty it at Strathroy. His facts are almost invariably wrong, and his figures—well, his figures are plastic and accommodating. No public man, certainly since Confederation, has less right than Mr. Cartwright to attempt a show of consistency. Whether the *souperon* of personal pique against the Conservative leader, on the ground that his claims as a financier were contemptuously set aside, be true or not, there is certainly a verisimilitude about it, read in the light of the Minister's vindictive speeches against his former chief, which cannot be blinked. The attempt to play upon popular ignorance, or rather popular indifference, not merely to him and his antecedents, but to any party politics more than a year old, is futile. He is now responsible for the financial status and credit of the Dominion, and we have no hesitation in