

that happened in connection with railway legislation. That was 32 years ago. To-day we have history repeating itself. It is not Mr. Stephen; it is Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann. On behalf of Canada, I wish to pay as warm a tribute as I can to those two men for their enterprise, their energy, their business acuteness, and for their ability to pull the wool over the eyes of the men who handle the treasury of Canada. If I were not such a good Christian, believing somewhat in honesty regarding the public, I would like to be one of the trio; I would like it to be Mackenzie, Mann and Cloran, and I would be a richer man than I am to-day. I have not a word of blame to utter here to-night against Mackenzie and Mann; I admire their energy too much. I am only sorry that I was not linked up with their enterprises, for then I would not have to work so hard to get a few dollars; I would come to the Government and choke them, and put my hand in the treasury and take the money out. That is what they are doing to-day. They are choking the Tory Government. I do not blame them. Five years ago, when they came before this honourable House and Parliament for one of their loans, I think it was \$25,000,000, I had sized up those two honourable gentlemen, knights of the Empire, to be the two ablest financial fakers in America. To-day, after looking over their career and seeing what the Government has done for them, and what it is prepared to do, I have come to the conclusion that those two men are the greatest pirates of the high financial seas of the world, in taking from Government treasuries and other institutions all the money they required either for themselves or for their enterprises. I have no blame to them, but I blame the captain and officers of the ship of state, one of whom is here to-day, who allowed the ship of state to be scuttled.

At six o'clock the Senate took recess.

The Senate resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Honourable gentlemen, when the Senate adjourned at six o'clock it was for the purpose of allowing the honourable members of the House to go and take a hearty copious meal. I am afraid that during war conditions, under the dictatorship of the food controller, you did not have a hearty meal, as this is a meatless day. Therefore I beg, in

continuation of this debate, to offer you a little dessert, coffee and cognac, on board the ship of state, which I said was about to be scuttled when this debate adjourned at six o'clock.

Before entering on the discussion of the measure proper, I have a slight correction to make, a clerical one, in regard to the statement which I made, that Sir John Macdonald had telegraphed to Sir John Abbott, attorney at the time, for another \$10,000. The statement should have been that Sir John Macdonald telegraphed directly to the president of the company, Sir Hugh Allan. That telegram, of course, was submitted to the attorney of the company, who was then Hon. John Abbott. The telegram came into the possession of the public through the Liberal party at the time. I am not going to condone or discuss the means whereby those documents came into the possession of the public, but I must confess that, notwithstanding the origin of their procurement, it helped the country a great deal in regard to public morality and ministerial responsibility. There is no doubt that the documents were stolen from the safe or the desk of the attorney of the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities at that time, and thank God for the stealing. Felix culpa, as they say of Adam's fault—a happy fault. Theologians will tell you to-day that the fall of Adam was a happy fall, because it brought about a new generation, a new resurrection of the human race. So did the fault of the man who stole those documents bring about a happy resurrection for the people of Canada in 1873.

With these explanations on that point, which, I believe, is the only error—and it is only a clerical one—that I committed—I submit to honourable gentlemen opposite, or even to honourable gentlemen on this side of the House, that if I made any other statement which is not based absolutely on facts, I am prepared to explain, or withdraw, or rectify it. I am open to correction by the highest or the humblest member on the other side, or by any of my friends on this side. I cannot be fairer than that in the discussion of a public matter. I do not wish to advance a single argument on the floor of this House, any more than I ever did on a public platform in this country, that I think in my soul and conscience is wrong, and I will not consider it an affront or an insult if any honourable gentleman can interrupt me at any moment and say, "What you are saying, Sir, is not