

We have all the indications of prosperity. The mere chance—the misfortune it is, certainly—of having an unsatisfactory crop, for the hon. gentleman says it is no worse, together with the fact that, in some instances, in our early experience, the manufacturers have made an over-production in some certain branches, has furnished the occasion of a cry; and there has also been ten or fifteen per cent. of frosted wheat in the North-West. It is a very strange thing that while that same frost cut down the crops in Minnesota and Dakota, and destroyed the whole of the corn crop through a large region in the Western States, you do not find the American press, the American statesmen, or American politicians, publishing to the world, and gloating over on the stump, the fact that their country has suffered in its production, and is not so prosperous as it has been in past years. It has been left to the Grits and the Grit press to defile our own nest. Much good may it do them. If they can persuade the farmer or the workman who, from over-production in a given mill or manufactory, has been obliged to work short time, that the National Policy is wrong, what care they—what care they about ruining the character of the country, depreciating its credit in the markets of the world, if they can only displace the National Policy Government and take its place? Hon. gentlemen opposite, like the individual depicted by Milton, who says it is better to rule in hell than to serve in heaven, would rather rule over a ruined country than sit quietly on the benches of the Opposition, seeing much against their will a people prosperous and a developing trade. But there are some wonderful omissions in this celebrated speech delivered by Lord Lansdowne the other day. Among other things he says the Washington Treaty ends in two years. It is of the very greatest importance to Canada that that subject should be dealt with by us now. Why, Mr. Speaker, I remember the time when every man in the Opposition called me Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold; I remember the time when I was hounded down; when I was called a traitor to the country, a traitor to its best interests, because I was in some degree, as one of the Commissioners, responsible for the Washington Treaty. It was called the “Washington Surrender,”—why, the surrender of Cornwallis was nothing to it. I was told I was a traitor. Benedict Arnold was a seraph to me. For the whole time from May, when the Treaty was signed, to the following winter, when we asked Parliament to confirm it, I was the victim of continuous attack. The language used was as plain and as honest Saxon as ever was used. There was no mincing; there was no circumlocution in the phrases applied to me. Of all the scoundrels who ever betrayed a country, I was the worst. And now I find the Leader of the Opposition, one of those gentlemen, who, no doubt to some extent, though always in a gentlemanly way, joined in these attacks upon me, says it is of great importance that that Treaty should not be allowed to drop. We must take it up, because there are great interests concerned, and he actually charges me and the Government of which I am the First Minister, with being guilty of a criminal omission, an omission he thinks he ought to bring up in the House in his place as a member of Parliament defending the interests of Canada, because we have not announced that we are going to take steps to continue that opprobrious Treaty. I remember the time when the then leader of the Opposition said, “And you have sold the territorial rights of Canada; you have given up the territorial rights of Canada for money, for money.” Said he, “I loathe the idea of the money we get or will get under that Treaty.” Yet we got \$4,500,000. *Non olet*, if the hon. gentleman will allow me to quote Latin, though he objected to my hon. friend doing it, the money did not smell badly. They not only took the money which they loathed as a bribe to sell our best inter-

ests, our national honour, but they applied to Her Majesty the Queen to grant the title of Knight Commander of St. Michael and St. George to the Minister who was at the head of the Department that got the money. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my hon. friend to one particular omission, which he dwelt on with great unction, which he dwelt on with special unction, and that is that, in my desire to centralize everything in this Government and the Parliament of Canada, I expended the money of the people of Canada in fighting out in England the claim of the Dominion Parliament to the escheats—estates forfeited by individuals leaving no heirs or representatives. That is the statement of the hon. gentleman. He said I was so anxious to centralize everything that I insisted upon that doctrine being carried out. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not design, I am quite sure, intentionally to misrepresent me, but there is a most unfortunate lapse in his memory. They say Mr. Gladstone has the same failing. He always believes anything he states at the time is true. Sometimes it is proved that it is not true, but at the same time everybody knows that Mr. Gladstone is a great statesman, and a saint, and a good man; and he is, no doubt. He is just as often as not wrong in his statements of facts, but he believes he is right when he makes a statement of any kind. The hon. gentleman says it is the Government of which I am a member that took up that question of escheats. Sir, from 1867 to 1873, when we went out, the Government took not one single step with regard to escheats. They never expressed an opinion in regard to that question where the escheats would go, and, although the hon. gentleman has got a lot of extracts, I challenge him or any man to state that anywhere from 1867 to now, at any time, he ever heard me express an opinion as to that contested question, whether the escheats went to the Provincial Government or the Dominion Government. I say I challenge the hon. gentleman or anybody to prove that, on any occasion, in Parliament or out of Parliament, I ever expressed any opinion on that question. It is a matter of little importance, as the hon. gentleman truly says. It did not give the Treasury anything, because everybody knows it is the practice, whenever there has been an escheat, if any relative, legitimate or illegitimate, if any friend, if any creditor of a person leaving an estate behind, can be found, the money is given up readily and willingly; it never has been considered a portion of the revenue of the country. It never has formed a portion of the revenue of the country. I do not believe that \$5,000, I do not know that even \$1,000, has ever found its way since Confederation into the Public Treasury from any escheat; therefore the charge that in any way whatever I desired in that instance to centralize the matter here is altogether erroneous; but, Mr. Speaker, I will go a little further. While no opinion was given by me as Minister of Justice, which I was from 1867 to 1873, strange to say, that the whole question arose on the decision of Mr. Mackenzie's Government; that the case arose on an opinion given by Mr. Lafamme, as the Minister of Justice of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, declaring that the escheats belonged to the Dominion Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Fournier.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, Mr. Fournier; not Mr. Lafamme. It was Mr. Fournier, now a judge, made by the hon. gentleman, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada; and a very good judge, I believe, Mr. Fournier is—a man who does honour to the Bench; but he gave his opinion, as Minister of Justice, that all the escheated moneys went into the Dominion Treasury, and not into the Provincial Treasury. And, Mr. Speaker, when we came in, and this celebrated Mercer case arose, Mr. Mowat wrote here to know what we would do about it, and we came to an agree-