

that it was wrong—that he was wrong, that the Premier was wrong, that every gentleman in that Government was wrong, and every Government has been wrong, since 1867; and now the accumulated wrongs, the accumulated breaches of the Constitution, committed by all the Governments since 1867, must be heaped on the devoted head of my hon. friend, who is to be made the scapegoat. That is the argument. However, any stake will do to break a man's head if you want to break his head, and the hon. gentleman has taken a stake, but I am afraid the stake was rotten, and it has broken in his own hands. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would say. The hon. gentleman made rather an insinuation against the Minister of Agriculture, who performed, and well performed, the duties of the Department of Railways and Canals during the temporary absence of my hon. friend. All those who know that gentleman, know his capacity for business; all those who know him, know that he is perfectly disinterested, and a more disinterested, a more unselfish man I never met than that hon. gentleman. I am proud to bear this testimony in his favour, that a more disinterested, a more unselfish man never existed; and the very insinuation, that because he might or might not have been interested in any way whatever in any railway, would actuate him in the performance of those duties, would be considered by those who know him well as a wanton insult. That hon. gentleman is superior to any suspicion of that kind, and I resent it as a taunt thrown out in the course of the hon. gentleman's speech, that will not in any way injure or diminish the respect that the House and the country have for John Henry Pope. Mr. Speaker, I say this was simply an attempt to attack my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and the Government through him. The motion, as I understood it from hearing it read, is rather peculiar. It not only passes censure on this temporary arrangement, but it passes censure on what the hon. gentleman supposes is going to happen. You may pass censure on the Government for what has happened, but it is reserved to the hon. gentleman for the first time to pass censure on the Government for what he says is going to happen. He says: "This continuance in such a course." How does he know there is to be a continuance in such a course? He should have ascertained that first, before he offered his resolution.

Mr. MILLS. It is continuing now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Merely a further continuance of this arrangement. Mr. Speaker, the continuance must be established, the continuance must be known, the continuance must be permanent, before there can be a censure. But the hon. gentleman resolves to censure my hon. friend, and I wish him joy of the motion. I do not think that it will take a very long time for the House to dispose of it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman meets this motion and the important questions which it raises in a manner which was not to be expected, having regard for his own statements when, at an early period of the Session, the subject was first broached. I broached the subject at an early period, and the hon. gentleman stated in the debate on the Address, if I remember aright, that no doubt it would be brought up later on. I broached it on a motion for papers. The hon. gentleman said the subject would be discussed, and no doubt, fully discussed, when the papers were brought down, and stated that he would be prepared then to discuss it. I cannot say that the papers have been brought down yet, because I have tired myself and wearied the House with iterated and reiterated demands for them—some came this evening; but even yet we have not got the commission laid on the Table. It is true an hon. gentleman has read portions of it; it is true that his supporters have had access to it; it is true then that the Minister of the

Interior and the Secretary of State have been able to see it from time to time and to read from it; but although the House, two months ago, lacking four days, ordered that that commission should be brought down, we have not got it into our hands to read it or to have the benefit of seeing what it contains. Now, Sir, even in advance of the production of that document, and not a very long period after the papers were laid upon the Table which the hon. gentleman said would be laid upon the Table, and upon which he supposed a formal discussion would be raised, a discussion is raised, and then the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, there is nothing in it; it is a very inopportune motion to have made." The hon. gentleman's excuses are various. First of all, he pleads *ad misericordiam*. He says this was an arrangement made, not in the interests of the public so much as in the interest of the health of the incumbent of the two offices. He says Sir Charles Tupper's health, as we regretted to learn, failed considerably and he was desirous of withdrawing from office, but the hon. gentleman prescribed for him, instead of withdrawal from the cares of office, a duplication of those cares. He prescribed that the office of Minister of Railways being too much, Sir Charles Tupper should add to the cares and worry, the care and worry of the office of High Commissioner for Canada, and this tonic, this prescription of the hon. gentleman, has had a wonderful effect—it has produced the result which was expected and hoped for. It was a very strange experiment to try, to tell a broken-down man that the proper mode to get well, was to add to duties which had been found too severe for him, other heavy and important duties. But it seems to me that no one would have objected, any more than they did when the First Minister himself was seized with a very serious illness and took a long and deserved recess—no one would have objected, I say, to such a course, for it is a perfectly proper course to take. If the Minister of Railways, or any other Minister, had broken down in health, no one would object to his obtaining such leave of absence as was necessary for the restoration of his health, and to necessary temporary arrangements being made for the discharge of his duties—not so satisfactory a discharge as if the work were done by the Minister himself, if in perfect health. These are exigencies which, we understand, are to be met, and in regard to which it was no impropriety to meet them in the manner to which I have alluded. But to say it is an excuse which is valid for the creation, and, as far we can learn, the permanent creation, of an arrangement and conjunction of offices which we believe uncalled for and unconstitutional, is not a statement which I can accept. I can perfectly understand the appeal *ad misericordiam* which the hon. gentleman makes; but I cannot accept it as an answer to a criticism of that arrangement. I have shown that precedents existed that the hon. gentleman's own case existed as a precedent, for granting to any Minister whose health had broken down such a period of ease and retirement from the cares of office, without adverse criticism from the other side, as might be necessary for the restoration of that health. That was the proper remedy in this case, and that being the proper remedy, the circumstance to which the hon. gentleman has alluded is no justification of this particular arrangement. It is not a secret that the arrangements which were made on that occasion were not the primary arrangements. It is very well known that, in the first instance, the intention was that the High Commissioner and the Minister of Railways should not be the same person; that Sir Charles Tupper was appointed to occupy the office of High Commissioner and would retire from the office of Minister of Railways. In anticipation of that event, even during the Session of Parliament, a very long account of the past services of Sir Charles Tupper was given to a correspondent of a Conservative newspaper, and produced at very great length, and it was his valedictory,