

this House. The whole circumstance was recalled to my mind the other day when I found the President of the Council also introduced by the Minister of Railways after the humiliation to which he had subjected him at a former time. I have no desire to say more, or to detain the House from other topics, but I will take occasion to refer to this subject hereafter. I have now simply to say this: in a parliamentary sense and as a Member of Parliament, that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman opposite (the President of the Council) should rise to his feet to support his present colleague, if he entertains the same opinion of his public conduct in a particular transaction, which it is shown by his speech he entertained some years ago. It would be a humiliating thing if such a question was not by the public asked and answered. It would be a reflection upon the public morality of the country, and it became a necessity with the leader of the Opposition to refer to that matter to-day. The President of the Council has said he has left that matter aside. He does not say that he retracts what he said some years ago, but that he puts the subject aside to forget it as the circumstances demands. If that be all he has to say in justification of himself for his attack upon his present colleague, then he is not justified in sitting where he sits now, nor was the hon. gentleman so attacked, nor are hon. gentlemen opposite justified in allowing him to occupy that position.

Mr. RYKERT. I simply desire to correct a statement of the member for Lambton. I happened to be a supporter of the Government of the late Sandfield Macdonald in the Parliament of Ontario, and to be sitting beside the present Chief Justice Wood, of Manitoba, when he made his celebrated speech, and I unhesitatingly assert that the member for West Durham has stated what is entirely contrary to the facts in asserting what we have heard about the speech made at a late hour of the night.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. RYKERT. The House was satisfied that the debate was to be prolonged.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman was afraid.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. Thinking that the debate was about to be adjourned he thought it important to send that missive across the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. I am certain, for I was a member of that House and sat alongside of Mr. Wood, then Treasurer of the Province, and the first information that I had, and the hon. members of the House had, was his having spoken immediately after he received that missive.

Mr. BLAKE. No, no.

Mr. RYKERT. And he never upon the floor of Parliament declared his opinion that they were acting unconstitutionally in holding their seats in Parliament. I unhesitatingly assert, as a strong supporter of that Government, that the first information we had of the disagreement in the Government was when he spoke after receiving that missive, and he never spoke but once on that occasion. The hon. gentleman knows right well that he spoke immediately after his sending the missive across the House, and the whole of his colleagues were astonished at his sitting in the Treasury Benches and making that speech. We all felt, as supporters of the Government, that if he desired to turn tail upon his colleagues he ought to have taken his seat on the other side of the House and then spoken. The facts were that from the intimate acquaintance of the hon. member for West Durham with the late Treasurer of the Province, and from the fact that he came with him a few days before in a stage coach, we all suspected that there was something wrong, and we

Mr. MACKENZIE.

were not at all surprised when we heard the hon. Treasurer stand in his place, and say that he thought the time had now arrived when they ought to resign their seats in Parliament because they did not enjoy the confidence of the House. No person gave the Government a stronger support than myself, and no person was more astonished than I was when the Treasurer arose and declared that he felt the time had now arrived when the Government should yield their places in the House, and the first information that we had was when this missive was sent across the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not impute any designed misinterpretation of facts to the hon. gentleman, but he is entirely in error. I did not say that Mr. Wood had spoken twice, because he did not speak twice. I said that one or two days after his resignation and after the final vote upon which the Ministry resigned, Mr. Wood came to me and asked me, "was the debate about to close?" I repeat—and it is impossible that I can be mistaken about it, because it was I who sent that note and not the hon. gentleman—I repeat it was either one or two days after, the very last day of that crisis, that Mr. Wood asked me how long the debate would last, and I gave him an answer; and seeing that my expectations were not verified, I sent a message to warn him that it was the last opportunity that he would have of making the statement he intended to make. Mr. Wood did not speak again, but he came to me afterwards and said: "I was obliged to you for sending me that word, but I had had a conversation with Mr. Sandfield Macdonald and he asked me not to speak again, and I agreed." "All right," I said, "all that I wished to do was to keep myself straight with you, because you had asked me when the debate would close." I had told him I thought it would not close that night.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman said distinctly that the Hon. Mr. Wood had previously spoken.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, and I say so now.

Mr. PLUMB. The hon. gentleman stated that the decision of the Treasurer was perfectly well known, that it was publicly known.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. And in pursuance of that he sent that message, and there is the gravamen of the whole charge.

#### WELLAND CANAL TENDERS.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to ask my hon. friend, the hon. the Minister of Railways, if he will send down a copy of the advertisement asking for tenders on the Welland Canal, and copies of the tenders received. We have here a contract, and we are asked to sanction this contract without knowing any of the surrounding circumstances, and we cannot possibly give any deliberate judgment on that until we have obtained the other documents. If there are no Orders in Council concerning this contract, there must be an advertisement for tenders, and we must have copies of the tenders sent in. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if he will bring these down without my making a motion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to make a motion. I am quite prepared to lay all the papers connected with the tenders on the Table of the House. The hon. gentleman is quite aware there were no advertisements; he is perfectly well aware of that, and that that is the reason this contract is made subject to the disallowance of Parliament. He knows we cannot bring down an advertisement that does not exist; but if he will put a motion on the paper for these papers—it might give me an opportunity of explaining the circumstances, I think, entirely to the satisfaction of the hon. member. At all events, every paper connected with the ten-