

Mr. Cartwright, Minister of Finance; Hon. Mr. Laird, Minister of the Interior; Hon. Mr. Christie, Secretary of State; Hon. Mr. Burpee (St. John), Minister of Customs; Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Glengarry), Postmaster General; Hon. Mr. Coffin, Receiver General; Hon. Mr. Ross (Victoria), Minister of Militia; Hon. Mr. Scott, member of the Privy Council without portfolio. (*Cheers.*) I propose to confine myself to the statement of the facts placed in my hands. It will be perceived that one department has yet to be filled up, to wit the Presidency of the Council. (*Loud cheers.*)

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: The announcement made by the hon. gentleman contains two or three matters to which some exception has to be made. It would, perhaps, be objected to that the hon. gentleman himself is not a member of the new Ministry, nor the hon. member who sits next him, the member for Halton (Mr. White). These members are both leading members of the party, stand equally high, and it is rather a matter of surprise that they have not been taken in.

There is another curious phase in the formation of this Government, and I protest against it. I protest against Hon. Mr. Blake being a member of the Government without portfolio. I protest against Mr. Scott on the same grounds. I say it is unconstitutional. There has been only one example of it, and that is the case of Lord Lansdowne, and that was a compliment to his age, he being a man of 90 years. This country wants no unpaid officers. This country wants, and is able, to pay every man for his services, and I would simply ask what the Government is going to do without Hon. Mr. Blake, and I would ask how long the Government would last without a representative Irish Catholic? It is absurd to suppose that Mr. Richard Scott, who has no portfolio, and who—I suppose, is *de facto*—head of the Government of Ontario, and is now to be a hanger-on in the Dominion Government without pay—will satisfy the Irish Roman Catholics of this Dominion but that is for them to say.

But there is one thing I have got to say further:—we have no right to keep Mr. Heney in custody without examination. That is a much more important matter for the liberty of the subject than the outgoing or incoming of a Ministry. That man is under a ban, and yet the hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) states that it was a matter of no consequence, whether he is to remain under that ban for, perhaps, another year. He is to remain under that fake charge—and I, who know Alderman Heney, know it is a foul charge, and an untrue charge—a charge that nobody who knows Ald. Heney will believe for a single moment.

The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have a summary despatch of this matter. I think so too. I think that on every subject that comes before Parliament, we ought to have the deliberate judgment of members of Parliament after hearing the arguments on both sides of the House; and yet was there not a round robin signed, by which members of the House, the highest tribunal in the country, precluded themselves from coming to an honest and fair judgment with respect to the motion against the Government of which I was the head? (*Cheers.*) Is it not true that members signed a document

sacrificing their position as members of Parliament, giving up their freedom of judgment (*cheers*), disgracing and degrading themselves, and changing themselves from a free and High Court of Parliament to a body of conspirators? (*Loud cheers.*)

And that will be the feeling of this country. If a man was going to be tried by a jury for the smallest offence, would it be considered a fair jury if they had previously signed a paper by which they had given it, their verdict, before the accused had an opportunity to state his case? (*Hear, hear.*) Look at these gentlemen opposite. Look at this Parliament.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is speaking to a motion that Alderman Heney be called to the Bar of the House; what connection is there between that motion and the speech he is making?

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I rise to order.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON: I say it is disorderly.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I rise to order. (*Cheers, cries of "Order", and uproar.*)

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Châteauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) is speaking on the point of order; the member for Kingston (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) interrupts him upon another point of order. I do not remember any instance of a point of order within a point of order. (*Cheers and laughter.*) I think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to state his point of order before another point is raised.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is a point of disorder. (*Cheers and cries of "Order".*)

Hon. Mr. HOLTON proceeded to state the point of order, and sustain it by argument.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk) rose amid cries of "Order."

The SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman was quite in order.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk): It has been mentioned by the right hon. gentleman that there was a conspiracy in this House. (*Cries of "Order" from the Opposition.*)

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman must speak to the point of order.

Mr. SMITH (Selkirk): I shall speak to the point of order. I will say that I myself did not sign any such round robin. (*Cries of "Order," and "Go on."*) He proceeded to make further remarks upon this point, but his voice was drowned by the general uproar.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is not in order. He is replying to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Kingston