

perance speeches there, yet he would allow a man his Sunday travelling expenses. The speaker concluded with one or two general remarks in reference to the estimates.

Mr. MACDONALD thought it was to be regretted that the Hon. Treasurer had made his Budget speech on the same day the estimates were brought down. There was a considerable increase upon the estimates, and in some instances he thought the Government had acted wisely in making the increases. He referred to some of the salaries which had been increased, many of which he thought were justified, whilst others could be explained when they were taken item by item. Under the head of miscellaneous, he found a most objectionable item. The Inspector of Division Courts had a salary put down to him of 1,400 dollars, and 900 dollars travelling expenses. This was an appointment which ought not to have been made, and the item was one which would call for an explanation. There were other items under this head which it would be necessary to explain. Under the head of Justice he found several items scarcely justified. He would not object to the item of \$30,000 for criminal witnesses, as it was a course initiated by the Government of Sandfield Macdonald. He approved of the increased remuneration to be given to the Deputy Clerks of the Crown. After questioning several other items, he said although there had been a large increase it was not their intention to find fault for the sake of finding fault. He referred to the expenditure asked for on behalf of the Government House, and said that the Commissioner had done himself what he had so sharply condemned his predecessor for doing.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR thought it must be very pleasing to see the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House smacking their lips. They thought they had found a way of getting back to the treasury benches. The hon. member for Leeds had referred to his (Mr. McKellar's) missionary labours. He had been a missionary a considerable length of time, and had been eminently successful in his labours. He had been eminently successful in the North Riding of Bruce, in the South Riding of Grey, in the South Riding of Bruce, in Middlesex, Elgin, and other counties. But did the hon. gentleman remember that he (the member for Leeds) laboured with him (Mr. McKellar), and that he was his contemporary? He worked in the east while he (the speaker) worked in the west. He then referred to the time when the hon. member for Leeds was connected with the great cause, and observed that he was just about to confer his degree upon him when he became an apostate and went over to the other side. He regretted now exceedingly, but he went on to the side where he thought the loaves and fishes were to be found. His hon. friend for Grey always paid his respects to him. They had done a good deal of work together. During the last summer they met in several constituencies. He was exceedingly amused one day on going to the station. He was then going to North Bruce and saw his hon. friend at the station. What he got to Bruce he saw the hon. gentleman get off the train. He did not know where he went, but he soon met a gentleman who said, "Have you seen Lauder, he has been asking if you had been seen?" Well, his hon. friend disappeared and the next he saw of him was at Guelph. At North Bruce the hon. gentleman knew all about the Proton outrage although they were told the other night by gentlemen opposite, but they could not discuss it till the whole thing had been reprinted. At one meeting he addressed he pointed his hon. friend out as a gentleman who had stood on the floor of that House some years ago and said he was not in the pay of the Toronto, Grey & Bruce Railway, and that if he received an emolument he would give it for charitable purposes. (Laughter.) He told them that the honourable gentleman had fulfilled his promise to the letter, and that he was a man who gave largely to charitable purposes—that he gave \$600 to one individual himself. The hon. gentleman had been of great service to him, and he regretted that they did not meet more frequently. He should have more remarks to make concerning gentlemen opposite, at a future period, who had unscrupulously attacked his public and private character, but he would defy them if their name was legion. He next alluded to the hon. member for Lincoln, who had been termed by a free and independent elector a "lusty little cock"—(loud laughter)—and another elector, referring to him, as a pert little fellow, said, "Why, sir, when we hear him speak, one would think it was the little cock that crew for Peter." (Continued laughter.) He reminded the hon. gentleman that after they had both made their statements, he (the member for

Lincoln) attempted to get up, and was hissed and groaned at, that he retired with shame upon his cheek, and, as was remarked by a bystander, there was a great resemblance between him and his scrap-book. (Laughter.) He warned that gentleman he had material with which to work, and he should have the whole truth and nothing but the truth. He did not intend to go on with the discussion then, but he had been provoked to these observations. Hon. gentlemen had also referred to the Rev. Mr. Horrocks Cocks. They said he employed him as an agent to whitewash him in England.

Mr. LAUDER said he observed that it was so rumoured outside.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said it was cowardly to repeat on the floor of the House rumours given rise to outside the House.

Mr. LAUDER held that the hon. gentleman was out of order in attributing cowardice to him. He was not afraid of the hon. gentleman nor ever was. He stated that it was rumoured outside that the Rev. Horrocks Cocks had gone to England on other business besides missionary business.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR maintained that it was a cowardly act to make such a charge openly when the charge was only founded upon a rumour. He was charged with having employed the Rev. Mr. Cocks to whitewash him. He had never employed him to perform any other duty but that of missionary. The hon. gentleman went on to explain that negotiations were going on between the Rev. Mr. Cocks and Mr. Carling, and that he would have been engaged by Mr. Carling but for the change which occurred at the end of the year. He had a letter from Mr. Dymond and his permission to use it.

Mr. RYKERT—Read it.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he would do so.—The effect of the letter was that Mr. Carling had informed him (Mr. Dymond) of his (Mr. Carling's) intention to notify Mr. Cocks of the change of Government, in order that Mr. Cocks might communicate with the new Commissioner.—Was not that sufficient?

Mr. CAMERON said he had the authority of Mr. Carling to state that he never employed Mr. Cocks or promised to employ him. Mr. Carling told him that if in the discharge of his duties he sent any emigrants to the country he would pay him.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said they had the statement of a gentleman whose veracity was never questioned.

Mr. MERIDITH said he had the authority to endorse the observation of the hon. member for East Toronto. There was no agreement made or contemplated.

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR said he did not state there was any agreement, and he would say nothing of the negotiations that took place between them. He merely introduced a witness, whose testimony would never be impugned, who stated that it was Mr. Carling's intention to employ him. It was stated that his (Mr. McKellar) knew of the vile accusations that were brought against Mr. Cocks before he employed him. He denied that in 1872, and challenged the hon. member to produce his proof.

Mr. LAUDER—Will the hon. gentleman say he had not a communication addressed to him before he employed Mr. Cocks?

Hon. Mr. McKELLAR—Yes, I will.—He proceeded to state that Mr. Cocks was employed before the accusations were made. He was employed after it was known in Ottawa and Quebec that charges were brought against him. He took the gentleman who made the accusation before Mr. Cocks, and he then admitted that the accusation was not true. A gentleman of the name of Roche was requested to make enquiries in England about Mr. Cocks, and he had received a letter from the Duke of Manchester in reply to his enquiries. He would read the letter to the House, which was as follows:—

"KIMBOLTON CASTLE,

"14th Jan., 1873.

"DEAR MR. ROCHE,—When the Rev. Horrocks Cocks went to Canada he had been appointed Honorary Secretary to the Emigration League, of which I was President. He went to Canada without consulting the Society or its council, so I think it was indiscreet of him—nothing more—to make use of the name of the League. He seems to me very energetic, and perhaps impulsive; but I believe he sincerely desires to promote emigration to our own