

help it. Well, I am free to confess that deeply as I regret that the dignity of the House should have been infringed upon by base and unmanly insinuations coming from an hon. gentleman who ought to be superior to the utterance of such insults, there is no source from which any such remark, bearing upon myself, could come more harmlessly, or from which I should be more pleased that such a remark should come than from the lips of the hon. gentleman. I do not forget that during the last five years that hon. gentleman offended the dignity of Parliament and the proprieties of parliamentary debate, to an extent which they never before were violated on the floor of this chamber, by the vile insinuations which he made with reference to the leader of the present Government. What did the hon. gentleman accomplish by the unmanly course he chose to adopt? Did he injure the right hon. gentleman whom he thus attacked. Sir, when the independent people of this country had the opportunity of judging between them they consigned him to oblivion, so far as they were able, as well as the administration of which he was a prominent member. They left him without a seat in Parliament, and they left the party with which he was connected, and the Government of which he was a member, with a mere corporal's guard in this House. So, Sir, I repeat if there is any source from which I should prefer to have had a reflection thrown upon myself, or an unmanly insinuation against me to emanate, that source is the hon. gentleman. I can make a great deal of allowance for him. Men generally judge of other men by their own hearts. The man who is dishonest himself, is the man who suspects dishonesty in others. It is the man who, looking into his own heart, says, what would I do if I had that opportunity, who suspects others of doing that which is base, unmanly and dishonorable. Sir, what is my position in this matter? The hon. gentleman has ventured to refer to the Canadian Pacific Railway contracts; what is my position with regard to them, before this Parliament, and before this country. If there was ever a Minister of the Crown, or a Minister of Public Works, who occupied an impregnable position, it is myself. Before this Parliament met, the duty had devolved upon me, of letting the contracts upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the extent of \$6,000,000, and when Parliament met, two years ago, at the instance of hon. gentlemen, I brought down every document and paper they asked for, bearing on the question, and with every opportunity at their command. Not a single word of insinuation, not a single question was raised among those hon. gentlemen. The House rose, and the editor and proprietor of a public newspaper, the *Toronto Globe*, who, I am glad to know, is within the sound of my voice, drawing venom from the depths of his own black heart, said that, in the columns of his paper, which if there was a word of truth in it, convicted the leaders of his party of being unworthy of public confidence. If there was a word of truth in the false and libellous utterances of that paper, it only went to show that the party of which he was the organ had the misfortune to have men representing them in Parliament utterly unfit to discharge their duties. The utterances of that newspaper showed that, with all the documents before them, these hon. gentlemen who were acquainted with public life, men second to none in ability, to scan with clearness and accuracy the acts of Members of Parliament, had no fault to find with them. Then, I say, how dare any journalist so insult the intelligence of the public, as to fill his columns with lying and slanderous utterances after Parliament had risen, and when, after all the facts were before the House, no man could be found in the party to venture an insinuation against me. What happened? We were told to wait till Parliament met, and then see where the Minister of Railways would be. Parliament met; the hon. gentleman asked for further

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

information and more papers—the information was given, and the papers laid on the Table of the House. They had these denunciations in their hands for weeks, and yet after all these denunciations in the press, Parliament rose without a man being found to endorse the contemptible utterances of that lying and slanderous paper. That was my position in this House. That is my position in this Third Session of Parliament. And goaded on to desperation by my challenge on the public platform, to any hon. gentleman to venture to formulate a charge against the integrity of my conduct as a public man—a challenge to discuss my conduct in the House or out of it—or to investigate it before any tribunal; it is only now that the hon. gentleman ventures, not to formulate a charge, but to do that which is the most unmanly act which one man can do to another—to throw out an unworthy insinuation. Suppose that instead of standing in this impregnable position, fortified as no public man ever was fortified, in regard to public acts upon which he was assailed—I say, instead of standing in that position, suppose this had been my position; suppose I had been entrusted as a public servant with the sale of public property; suppose that £3,000,000 of public bonds had been put into my hands to sell; and suppose that I had gone to England; and suppose that I had adopted a new and different mode from what my predecessors had adopted, and instead of placing them open to public competition I had sold them by a secret and private bargain; and suppose that when I came back I was not able to show the amount of money they were worth, and on being asked to whom I had made the sale, I refused to disclose it down to this hour. Why, Sir, I should have excused the hon. gentleman for venturing such unmanly expressions—I should have excused him for forgetting, not what is due to me, but what is due to himself.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I do not wonder, Sir, that the man who has only got to look on his right hand, when his friends and colleagues are in their seats, to see the man of the other ten thousand, and on his left hand to see the man of the thirty-two thousand, should not like to have called to his mind that most infamous passage in the history of Canada, when the honor of Canada, the interests of Canada, were sold and sacrificed by these men, as far as it was possible for them to do it, for Sir Hugh Allan's three hundred thousand or two hundred thousand of money; and, Sir, I have to tell this hon. gentleman that, although I could have excused him for not having deserted his chief in his hour of need, yet, Sir, after the facts were proven and disclosed, and after his daring to justify and defend that most outrageous transaction, I hold him at the least to be an accomplice after the fact, and very nearly as guilty, in intention, as the man who was himself the criminal. As for the insinuation which he ventures to throw out against me, Sir, every man in London acquainted with the Stock Exchange, every man acquainted with the financial history of Canada, knows perfectly well that a more untrue statement or insinuation, whichever you like to call it, that I instituted a new mode of selling the bonds of Canada, never was made. I adopted the plan adopted by my predecessors, which was approved by the authorities in London, and which, I believed, was most in the interests of the country. And if there had been a shadow of suspicion arising out of that transaction, that suspicion would have attached to Messrs. Baring & Glyn or to Sir John Rose, rather than to myself.

Mr. PLUMB. I think I am justified in rising at this moment to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to the unseemly exhibition made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I have sat in this House for many years, and I do not remember, in the whole course of the stormy period of four or five years during which we sat on that side of the House, and in which