**9-Norquay in the Legislative Library of Manitoba *Newspaper Hansard* 1871-1890-93pp**

Norquay-related speeches in the newspaper cuttings preserved in the LLM scrapbooks of debates, in notes taken by Gerald Friesen.

**Manitoban 18 March 1871**

15 March – Opening – at 3:00 the Lt Gov drove from Govt House – band played God Save the Queen.

Throne Speech: Lands: HBC survey has been lost within the last year. But a copy has been found “which appears to have been made with great accuracy.”[ **Manitoban 6 May 1871:** sitting in Legisl Council of 1 May – bill to legalise the Plans of Survey of the HBC was passed.

James McKay is pres of Legislative Council, equivalent to Speaker

Donald Gunn Sen. – this is a day “that will ever be memorable not only in the annals of this Province, but in the annals of a continent. (Hear, hear).”

HJH Clarke Atty Gen; Girard Treas; A Boyd PW and Agr; Capt Howard Prov Secr

In his opening comments, **Hay** welcomed Archibald’s words on development but “there is one point on which some of us must disagree – the forgetting the past. If we look for any justice … we cannot forget what has passed. I hope that in justice to what has passed, the House will some day take into consideration certain events which have taken place in this country, and thoroughly investigate them.” Moves postponing reply to speech from the throne. Sutherland seconds. Dftd.

Norquay and Hay defend applications for review of electoral illegalities in Schultz claim and St. Paul’s as well as Headingley ridings, even though two former were not in proper form. “…it is not wise I think to surrender ourselves to such nice intricacies at the outset. We might get beyond our depth of judgment. (Laughter).” The protests, said Clarke, were “couched in language of covert insult…” The two letters were rejected. Interesting that JN takes active part on first sitting day. The protests were accepted next day as petitions.

**Manitoban 25 March 1871**

16 March sitting: 3:00pm: Clarke notes striking of committees, and that members can change to another committee, “as long as the balance between French and English members was preserved….” Norquay is on Rules and Sessional Regulations, Privileges and Elections, Education, and Printing.

17 March, 20 March – note gift of books and documents from QC assembly Speaker.

20 March 1871 – Clarke claims to have “17 years experience in the courts.” He notes the need for simple law. It isn’t French law, as some have said. He congratulates Dubuc on his generous speech – says Dubuc is the youngest member of the House. Dubuc had said he had been insulted.

21 March – Lemay gave notice of motion re what measures were being taken by Govts of Canada and Manitoba “to ensure, with the shortest possible delay a treaty with the Indians occupying a large tract of land in the Province” and of another motion for correspondence between MB and Ottawa “relative to a treaty for the extinction of Indian title to certain tracts of land situated in Manitoba.”

Norquay gave notice of motion re assigning some definite limits to lands in Assiniboine and Portage districts: “I refer to the lands already occupied by settlers there. Strangers are coming in behind the old settlers, and as there are no proper limits allowing what belongs to the old settlers and what is open to others, newcomers do not know where to take up claims.” Clarke said this was Ottawa’s issue.

22 March – 23 March --

**Manitoban 1 April 1871**

Re sitting of 24 March 1871 – Speaker took the chair at 3:00 pm, ministers presented reports, and an address to the Governor General “on his elevation to the peerage” was adopted. House adjourned at 5:00.

At a later sitting, the Assembly received a petition from Lake Manitoba district asking for government aid in leaving the chase and starting farms. Warned that the government had little money for such support, members nonetheless passed a motion to refer to committee, though it carried only after the Speaker’s vote in favour. Norquay voted against with nine others. [support for free enterprise]

Norquay asked one of the first questions -- whether: “… the settled lands of this Province, outside the surveyed portion, are such lands as by the Manitoba Act are to be vested in the Crown, and administered by the Government of Canada for the benefit of the Dominion.”

And “Whether, in the opinion of the Government, settlers on the banks of the Assiniboine, outside the surveyed [by HBC] portions, will be entitled to the two miles depth enjoyed by settlers within that limit?”

Attorney General replied that there seemed to be two classes of lands outside the HB surveyed portions, one within and one outside “the limits of the extinguished Indian title. The former are on the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, within the two miles limit, but above the surveyed parts of the Settlement. The latter are outside of that limit, as well as outside the surveys. Settlers in peaceable possession of the latter class of lands at the time of the transfer will receive a grant. No provision is made for the settlers on lands of the first class, but there is every reason to believe they will be dealt with by the same rule.” The shape of the lots will “probably” be rectangular or square

Norquay pushed again: “Under what clause of the Manitoba Act, is it the opinion of the Government, these lands come?” Attorney Gen says none – “This matter has evidently been an oversight – it has been overlooked altogether.”

The Provl Treasurer explained in French.

Hay asked that all bills be printed in French before second reading. Norquay supported, vote lost to French and Govt party 11-10.

Would militia remain in MB? Yes, desirable,… “particularly in reference to the Indian assemblage expected here this spring….” Treasurer explained in French.

**March 29: Norquay/Burke** motion that special committee (incl JN) be formed to set out “measures …to define the boundaries of the several settlers on the Assiniboine and Red River, outside the surveyed portion of the Province, “whose claims have been overlooked in the Manitoba Act. (Spence, Hay, Burke, JN, Girard)

On the same day, he chaired committee of the whole to consider adoption of Canadian currency as Manitoba’s monetary standard. [the value of pound sterling $4.86 2/3, yet people accept it as $5 – and HBC makes over 13 cents/pound on each conversion.]

**30 march**: was the vote in Headingly a tie? Did the RO vote? JN voted in minority (13-7) – his side failed to require another election in that riding, and Taylor was unseated. Cunningham to replace him, it is said on 4 April.

**Manitoban 15 April 1871**

**Assembly 31 March 1871** – JN in chair for committee of whole

4 April: Norquay lost vote re measure calling for a new ballot in Headingly by 14-6 vote (he voted with Hay, Bourke, Sutherland, Spence, and F. Bird).

No contract for the sale of goods for $40 Cdn or above shall be good “unless some note in writing of the bargain be made and signed by the parties to be charged by the contract.” Royal objected. JN inquired about entries in a merchant’s books – contract?

5 April: JN asked if Govt “intended taking any measures against the Indians who trespassed on the lands of settlers…. **Manitoban 15 April 1871**

11April: committee of whole, JN in chair, adjourned at 7:00

12 April: discussion again re Public Highways with JN in chair. Bill approved, then Speaker returned to chair, and bill passed.

**Manitoban 22 April 1871**

12 April – debate on a measure to ensure that manure was not piled on the river bank and then fell into the water – 50 or 100 feet back was required – etc.

House sat until 10 pm

13 April – Master and Servants bill – JN proposed amendment to provide “safeguards to the servant.” Recess at 6:00, returned at 8:00, adopted a revised amendment to the same purpose, and sat until 11:00.

14 April – bill re incorporation of Bishop of St. Boniface: JN wanted to limit the quantity of land that could be held by the Bishop – to not more than 5000 acres –he did not think “that either of the Bishops in the Province should be allowed to buy up land in unlimited quantities.” He hoped education would “become part of the care of the Government if the Province, and the sooner the better.” As for the two churches not being able to rely on subscriptions to support them, why not? The Presbyterians here do. “In my opinion, the sooner we all learn to be independent, the better.” Yes, 9; nays 10. JN lost. French opposed him, cabinet split in 2 each.

**Manitoban 29 April 1871**

Sitting 17 April 1871; 19 April; 20 April; 21 April; 24 April:

JN asked if Govt intended “to open up a road from the Assiniboine at or near High Bluff, to communicate with St. Joe, Dacotah Territory. He took High Bluff as being the point nearest Lake Manitoba, through which lake there would, probably, be communication with the western part of the country hereafter. A great deal of traffic would, he believed, come over the road he spoke of, if it were opened up. I would afford the people of that district, a new market, in enabling them to send supplies to St. Joe as well as to the town of Winnipeg. Again, it would form a good emigrant route – giving persons who desired to go to the Portage quarter an opportunity of going there direct, instead of compelling them to go round via Fort Garry.” Govt will look into it.

Inquiry from McTavish about Govt supplying seed wheat – many farms suffering from grasshoppers. “…under the old patriarchal government of Assiniboia, seed wheat was always distributed.”

25 April/71 – McTavish moved that a grant of $1500 for seed wheat to be made available to those who needed it. Hay and Norquay opposed. Breland, Dubuc and Lemay supported. Carried.

Hay resolution whereas “bands of armed men” seized ufg in 1869-70, imprisoned HM subjects, shot Scott, ask His Excellency to conduct “a thorough investigation of the troubles of 1869 and 1870 --- the arrest, trial and punishment of the guilty parties – and further that those who suffered losses during the time aforesaid may be indemnified according to their losses.” Some will say “old sores… should be forgotten. But with me it is a principle that public crimes merit public punishment….”

Norquay seconded the motion. It would “be very conducive to the peace of the Province ….During the affair last winter – which all must deplore – many persons suffered – some in property – some in reputation; and I do not see how these people can be indemnified until there has been a full, fair and impartial investigation…. even-handed justice to all. It is but right that the suffering should be recompensed, and that those on whom a stigma has been cast should have an opportunity of clearing themselves and appearing in their true colors. For this reason I desire an investigation – not for the purpose of reviving old grievances or animosities, but to establish the Settlement in the old peaceful, friendly position it occupied before the troubles arose.”

**Clarke objected to the preamble**, saying it prejudiced the case of those involved. He moved an amendment leaving the issue to Ottawa.

Norquay agreed that the resolution covered the case and voted for the amendment. Carried 14-5 (Spence, F Bird, Bourke, Hay, Sutherland) Manitoban 29 April 1871

**Manitoban 6 May 1871**

Legisl Council; 1 May – bill to legalise the Plans of Survey of the HBC was passed.

27 April: Leg Assembly: Considers dog tax (JN in chair): adopted -- $1 on all dogs; Royal wants to exempt L Manitoba because they were poor, brought fish to province via dog trains, had no horses. His amdmt carried 10-9 [JN? – Journals?]

28 April: every male ages between 18 and 60 liable to the performance of one day’s statute labour annually. A man with a horse or ox shall perform an additional day’s statute labour – defeated? Hard to tell.

House adjourned at midnight.

29 April:

1 May: school bill proposes to split education fund in half, RC and Prot. In debate someone said French children were backward and, instead of halves, the attendance should determine the proportions, which would ensure that the schools rendered an account of their spending. Clarke replied that “the French population up to this age were equally advanced in the scale of education and civilization as those of the English population at the same age.” A new amendment would divide the surplus “according to the amount the various districts assess themselves for.” JN, Hay, Sutherland, Bourke lose.

2 May: sessional indemnity for members amended to $300. Bec. of length of session, costs of hotel etc – but back to $200 hereafter. JN defended this increase in next day’s debate.

3 May: close of session: guard of honour of 100 men of Ontario Battalion drawn up in front of the Parliamentary building, band played God Save the Queen, and Artillery fired salute. Archibald spoke.

Estimates for 1871: 7 members of Leg Council; 24 members of Assembly -- $200 each but $300 for this heavy session – Ministers get $2,000 each except Public Works $1,000; about 20 civil servants; $20,000 for roads and bridges, 14,000 for police, 6,000 for school support, 6000 for public bldgs.

**Manitoban 16 January 1872 Tuesday edition [really is the 15th January issue – the regular date]**

16 January/72: opening of 2nd session of parliament: smallpox did not reach us here (though did hit farther west], little drought, better crops [though Gunn adds latter not as high as in good years], and return of buffalo “to the [Saskatchewan] plains, in numbers unequalled since 1859….”

**Manitoban 22 January 1872**

17 Jan 1872 sitting: Hay amendment to reply to speech from the Throne: “regret that Your Excellency has not recommended any measures to this House, whereby the Half-breed claims could at once be settled. Also the control of the public lands of the Province secured. And the manner intended to deal with the Indian population in respect to the franchise.

Clarke criticized Hay, and the small group of “special missionaries … preaching up their views… The simple object of these agitators was to raise an excitement for their own personal profit.” Canada used to rely on Her Majesty’s troops stationed in Canada, not our own soldiery for the defence of our own territory. But, now we owe a debt to the “stalwart sons of the Province, who went to the front, shoulder to shoulder, to defend their liberty” [against the threatened Fenian invasion.] “It was understood to a great extent, that the troops of Her Majesty stationed in Canada, were to be depended on for the protection of Canada. …for the first time in Canadian history, we have a thoroughly Canadian force, commanded by Canadian officers, coming over a Canadian route, finding themselves here at Fort Garry, ready to spill their blood in defence of their country. Here is another proof that the day of tutelage for Canada has passed away, and that she has taken her place for the first time among the nations of the earth, (cheers).”

Indian franchise: see election bill coming: “Under the law as it stands, every householder being such here, a year previous to the proclamation, is entitled to vote, and by that law an Indian householder has as clearly the right to vote as any other householder. But this, as I said, is a matter to be dealt with yet. The Dominion law, declaring an Indian receiving an annual allowance, a minor would, the Attorney-General thought, settle the matter in future.”Sitting of 17 Jan 1872: **Manitoban 22 January 1872**

Hay, Sutherland, Spence, F. Bird, Bourke in opposition here.

**29 January 1872 The Manitoban**

23 January 1872 sitting: Clarke again criticizes the “five agitators” who are campaigning in the province against the govt.

How much liquor is coming into the province? “…a vast quantity…” said the Atty Genl. Should there be an extra tax on it?

26 January – question of pay for session -- $300? Sutherland says $6 per day – no incentive to lengthen debates. Discussion. $300 agreed.

**5 February 1872 The Manitoban**

31 Jan – DA Smith arrived – delayed by cars in MN, also by rly business of province in Lower Provinces. Schultz contesting Smith’s election for Winnipeg and St. John’s

1 Feb – (to be printed next issue)

2 Feb – resolution criticizing Ontario legislature for its resolution re Scott as intervening in MB matters, esp matters that took place when the area was an Imperial Govt responsibility. It is “a piece of impertinence” on ON’s part “We ask them to attend to their own business and allow us to manage ours (cheers)”.

Hay says they merely want murderers to be brought to trial. “It is the wish of a majority of the population that there should be an investigation into this case, so that at once and for ever, this vexed question should be set at rest….[For the second time during the debate there was applause in the galleries: Dr. Schultz, Rev. Mr. Carrie leading off.] The Atty.Gen. called attention to the fact that there were strangers in the gallery, and it was cleared at once by the Sergeant at Arms.”

Donald Smith defends Archibald strongly – he has done well in difficult circumstances. “Again, even were it in our power, would it be wise for us to deal with this matter of the death of Scott? There is not one man in this House who does not, equally with his fellow citizens in other Provinces, deplore this sad event; and all would equally wish to see justice done in the premises.

Hay – the people were insulted when Archibald “went and shook hands with a man who was an outlaw.” Girard and Smith defend again.

Hay, Sutherland, Spence, Bourke, F.Bird opposed – dfted 18-5

5 Feb – DA Smith seconded Boyd – motion re “very serious troubles,” a question that only the Imperial Govt is competent to deal with, asking Queen what action has or will be taken “with the view of satisfying justice and the best interests of this country.” Carried unanimously

**Manitoban 12 Feb 1872**

Re sitting of 1 Feb: urge feds to build public bldgs in MB

Re resolution re half breed lands: Clarke: “The question is one which has given rise to a good deal of anxiety and ill feeling. A treaty had, in fact, been entered into between the native population of this country and the Dominion of Canada; and under it the Dominion took possession of this country. That possession they obtained on one condition, and that alone, viz., that the native population should have 1,400,000 acres of the public lands set apart for ever for their use and benefit.” Surveyors have not marked the back lands, but the land on the river banks “the property of those old settlers, (hear, hear).” The “reserve belonging to the native population of the country (cheers)” must be defined. Also hay cutting privileges: two miles back. And this not just for “the native population” but for the old settlers who came here long ago.

Ed Hay approved – but not land as a bloc – “His people desired that each one should be allowed his choice of location.”

Sitting of 5 Feb: (see above) Smith says: we all regret the troubles. “There can be no doubt but the people of this country had good reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in which the Government of the Dominion was introduced into this country. There is equally little doubt, but that errors were committed on all sides.” Thus we call for investigation by Imperial Govt – best in their hands. (cheers). Clarke agrees.

Hay does not: in 1869, “The French people robbed the only authority we had from us…. The French [in taking Upper Fort Garry] were in force – and force enough to put down one Government and maintain a false one, on its ruins for some time. The English people at that time, and to the present day, maintain that the action of the French was an error which resulted disastrously in the shedding of blood…. when an investigation takes place, it will show that Riel, Lepine, and the others were not alone to blame, but that men outside the Province must bear a large portion of the responsibility.”

Clarke notes “false” govt – but Hay was in it – “and he appears as drawing his pay regularly from a set of rulers whom he now pronounces to be false (laughter).”

Hay – I supported that govt “conditionally”

Norquay: “I am sorry to see the remarks made on this resolution, declining to so low an ebb. The resolution before the House is certainly called for, and I am happy to believe it will be endorsed by every member. There is no doubt that the insurrection of 1869 left a legacy of heart-burnings and angry feelings, much of which remains to this day. It is nothing but right, then, that an effort should be made to allay these hard feelings, that such an investigation should be made as will enable the innocent to clear themselves at the bar of public opinion, and place the burden of responsibility for guilt on the right shoulders. The step, I think, is a judicious one, the only thing I have to complain of respecting it, being that it falls short. There does not seem to be any request to Her Majesty to make the investigation.”

Smith – yes, to Hay, I did go to English parishes, and “certainly did recommend to them, in the cause of peace, order and saving of human life, that they should take part in a Convention which I believed was for the good of the country. My motive was a good one (hear, hear)….” As for McTavish, “he knew what he was about, and therefore would not attempt that which he believed would have been the greatest evil which could befall the country…. [he] acted with sagacity and humanity…. [and] forebore resorting to extreme measures, which must have resulted in plunging the country into a sea of bloodshed and trouble, from which it would have taken years to emerge, and it might, too, have resulted in the estrangement of the country from the British Crown (hear). The Government of England has already endorsed what he has done, and every one in the Province will say of him, that he was a man who deserved well of this country (cheers).”

Dr. Bird: “…Some here look with pride on that uprising. Others represent a class who at that time jeopardized life and property to put down what they believed to be a senseless rebellion. We differ very widely, indeed….”

Resolution carried unanimously.

Sitting of 7 Feb: Smith’s seat of Winnipeg and St. John’s discussed, and Schultz protest

**The Manitoban, 26 Feb 1872**

Sitting of 21 Feb – close of second session

Estimates for 1872: $300 per member of Leg Assembly and Leg Council, $2,000 for 3 Ministers, but only $1,600 for Public Works

A total of $81,423.

**The Manitoban 4 March 1872**

**Legislative Council: sitting of (perhaps) 6 Feb 1872:**

**Re license bill – clause 19, no selling liquor to Indians:**

Dr. O’Donnell: Indians of Indian settlement are “to all intents and purposes a civilized people. The rights of franchise has been extended to them, and they have their representative not only on the floor of the House but absolutely in the Executive Council.”

**Leg Assembly, sitting of 13 Feb 1872:**

Mr Lemay’s bill for the destruction of blackbirds was read a first time.

**15** Feb– Hay tries again re review of 1869-70. Dftd 17-5, JN in majority. Smith absent.

19 Feb – suffrage – after 12 months residence

**The Manitoban 8 Feb 1873**

**5 Feb 1873 Opening of Parliament: Mrs. Norquay present, and Mrs. Captain Kennedy, Mrs. Dr. Schultz**

**Lt Gov Morris, meeting assembly for first time**

He hopes allotment of land to Metis, pioneers of the Selkirk Settlement, and titles to other residents of province and to the volunteers are progressing to a final settlement, and fair terms for rights of common and hay cutting as held by settlers will be determined…

**Future…** “in which the two great races who have mainly peopled this Province will unite in earnest, harmonious efforts to secure the advancement of the general interests….

**6 f**eb – Clarke resists Hay’s suggestion of vote by ballot – as “injurious”

**The Manitoban 8 March 1873**

Sitting of 25 Feb. – resoln to GG that “all old settlers and their descendants, of unmixed blood,” be given a grant of land

Lemay motion: regret delay of Dom Govt in settling the land question, and that whereas much land has been “thrown into market, and made subject to private entries, even before the surveys are complete, and thereby allow foreign speculators to secure more than thirty thousand acres of the most available lands suitable for settlement and farming….” Therefore be it resolved – that Crown lands be withdrawn from public sale or private entry

Clarke announces railway from Pembina to Ft Garry, and from L Superior to MB. to be completed by 1876. “…knowing that some of the large capitalists connected with the Canada Pacific Railway were interested in the Northern Pacific, we feared that we might be left many years at the mercy of the United States (hear, hear)…. [loss of bonding system wld have been trouble] “and the desire of some of the capitalists who figure at the Dominion Board of Trade meeting might have been realized. Many of those gentlemen are known to have been for years past and still are strongly in favour of annexation to the United States (hear, hear)….[They talk of rly to Pembina via US, then through Canada to Pacific] “...You are right it would not be better, it would be suicidal to our national interest if not to our national life (cheers).” Much national pride – “That will in the not very far distant future make Canada one of the most powerful nations of modern times – (cheers) – a nation that will yet dictate terms to America….”

Royal similarly enthused.

Resolution of enthusiasm – JN in 10 yes; Lemay added in 6 no.

Act re travelling on highways amdmt: in winter, vehicle must carry two bells **The Manitoban 8 March 1873**: Sitting of 25 Feb.

26 Feb – Smith returns, was at CPR organization, nominated McDermot as MB rep on the directorate (cheers).

Clarke hoped Smith wd advocate for higher duties on alcohol in Ottawa.

**28** Feb – Clarke sees liquor as a curse – “where drinking is carried to excess there is a great deal of misery and crime….” – thus a very strict licensing act is proposed

**1 March** – Public Works has “considerably exceeded” the estimates. **JN agrees** that he overspent on roads – “solely with a view to meet the requirements of the travelling public.” Bridges were damaged in spring, roads needed work. Had to rebuild the bridge in St James that, “much against the will of the Government, yielded to the pressure of the spring freshets (laughter) and fell in…” We built 783 feet of bridges at a cost of $6282.38. And built “fascined or faggot roads,” 4332 yards at cost of $1572.90.

D Smith said well done to Govt – time to ask fed govt for larger subsidy.

School bill – a clause in the act “debars members of one section of the board from visiting any school except in their own section….”

3 March – Smith moved 2nd reading of “Half-breed Land Protection Act” said “I think the Half-breeds equal to other people in intelligence, etc., but had from custom been confiding and therefore were liable to fall an easy prey to designing persons.” Issue of 1.4 million acres: people “were beset by speculators urging them to give up their land, and succeeded by means in many cases neither honest nor just in persuading them to part with these lands for no consideration. I say no consideration, for no one can say that £3 or £4 is a fair consideration for 140 acres of land.” True, some paid fairly and others bought to keep land out of hands of “the land sharks.” – and wld surrender the lands they bought. They aren’t the issue. It’s the “men who wish to enrich themselves at the expense of the confiding Half-breeds.” I say “…ought we not to do our best to prevent such results?....” I would give reparation to the purchases – the parties who gave up their lands “shall have them back on the repayment of the amount advanced to them…” J Royal seconded.

**Manitoban: 8 March 1873: Prorogation 8 March (today):** Legislative expenses of 24 members at $300 and 7 in Leg Council; Ministers -- $2000 each (including Public Works). About 10 civil servants of various ranks, plus police – total of $72,665.

On this occasion he insisted bluntly that Métis would and could adjust to the new order quickly. Contracts must be regarded as sacred. According to Norquay, “the verdict of the people will be that this Bill is an insult to the Half-breeds themselves.” And he then went on to declare, “When I state my opinion I state it as a Half-breed myself….” [The **Manitoban 15 March 1873**, p. 1] [ Le Métis 5 April 1873, p. 2].

*The Manitoban* 15 March 1873, p. 1 and *Le Métis* 5 April 1873, p. 2. The bill passed, went into effect, and seems to have been priced into speculators’ calculations for the next four years. An influential deputation of seventeen French and Métis leaders including eight assembly members met with the cabinet in February 1873 to make the case against “the wholesale buying up of Half-breed claims in the Province,” a “traffic” that was “utterly antagonistic to the spirit of the Grant.” *The Manitoban* 15 February 1873.

**1874**

**Manitoban 7 Feb 1874**

Session began in Court House on 5 Feb at 3:15. Clarke went to Ottawa to talk better terms, but govt fell, elections held -- except in BC and MB thus far – nothing can be done – moves house adjourn until 2 July. Members protest – half-breed land claims, hay question, etc – enlargement not the only issue.

Hay resigns his seat and as leader of the opposition. He is a candidate in fedl election. Clarke says he was courteous and straight forward opposition. Has our respect etc.

M**FP 9 July 1874** – “Manitoba Parliament” Girard outlines govt policies; Cabinet is Hay Public Works; Davis Treasurer; Dubuc Attorney General; McKay Pres of Council (tba); Ogletree w/o portfolio

-Clarke agitates -Lepine trials:

-who represents “the English Half-breeds” in Cabinet? Not Mr. Hay

- Ogletree unable to represent “the old settlers”

- who represents “the French Half-breeds”?

-The govt in general: “…they do represent the worst class of French in Lower Canada…”

-We would do redistribn with “an equal division… eight French, eight old settlers, and eight Canadian. (Applause in the galleries.)”

-The spilling of blood in 1869-70: “that brutal mistake, when they imbrued their hands in blood, they became what the law calls them to-day – murderers.”

Dubuc objects: Clarke brought many indictments in every court term in order to draw $1000 to $1500 in additional payments.

Davis: criticizes Clarke; “As little as I know about law having only spent a few months in the Law Department of McGill College, I think I know as much law as Mr. Clarke.”

Speaker: “I wish to call attention to marks of approbation in the galleries, that cannot be allowed, we are not in a theatre.”

“Considerable wrangling between Mr. Davis and Mr. Clarke then took place and Mr. Clarke told Mr. Davis he was prepared to meet him whenever and wherever he chose and to name his distance. (Laughter.) The speaker again insisted upon order.”

Davis: “…He then went on to speak of why he had taken the course he had in defeating the Government and said it was not done to aid Canadians; it was done for the good of all. That the French could not be blamed for hatred to a man who betrayed their church…. [Clarke objected]. Davis “was not going to be guided by men who came to this country and who were a curse to the country they came from; …stunk in the nostrils of honest men….”

Davis notes fire in former MB parliament bldgs – hopes finances can be made clear. Wonders if Clarke “would be able to tell how it came that certain parties came here almost in indigence and are now wealthy. He was satisfied that some of the late Ministry were honest….”

**Daily Free Press 14 July 1874:** redistribution by new govt is identical to old – 14 Engl and 10 French. We think 16-8 would be more equitable “but the proportion proposed admits the principle of representation by population….”

Re sitting of 13 July: J McKay agreed to be President of Council.

Petition: “from Henry Prince (chief) and others praying that the name of St Peters be changed to Dynevor.”

Norquay on redistribution bill: “…a very unsatisfactory one. It is an attempt to crush out the old settlers in certain localities. The members of this House were elected by the men who bore the burden and heat of the day; they were elected by the pioneers of this western country, and yet we find them in three short years attempting to crush out the very men who elected them. They are obliterating those ancient landmarks so dear to us all. They tell us they are giving fourteen English to ten French. Did not the Bill of the old Government do that, do it in such a way as to preserve almost intact those ancient landmarks, and at the same time give due representation to the newcomers? While we are willing to extend the hand of friendship to all…. the Bill now before the House did great injustice to the old settlers, and he thought it was a sad thing to see those old pioneers, who had struggled long and hard in the midst of difficulties and dangers, to be wiped out of existence by those creatures who have come in the last year or two. He thought that due consideration should be given to the old settlers as well as to the new, and as a representative man of the old settlers he protested against the passing of the Bill in its present shape, treating them as it did, with contempt and injustice.”

**Lemay** introduces new bill, as if a member of cabinet w/o office

**15 July 1874 DMFP Editorial** – praise for Royal speech of 14 July – courteous thoughtful speaker – yesterday gave “a succinct history of the Manitoba government…” from 1870. FP says “that he claims to be, and is the accepted leader of the French party.” He supports the new Govt., as do the rest of “the French party” But the school law is bad, says the FP – grants to the two sections are equal, but the Protestant section “is doing at least four or five times the quantity of legitimate common school work….” – grant shd be distributed *pro rata*.

**14 July 1874, DMFP – Hansard:** Royal speech on responsible govt – not until now has the Cabinet been truly responsible.

Davis on finances for 1873: roads est. $5000, spent $8920. Clarke received $8,000 in Admin of Justice line, where the est. was $9000 and actual spent was $23,056.

**16 July 1874, DMFP:** Girard Registration of Voters Bill – “clause provides that any person or Indian receiving an annuity from the Dominion Government shall not be placed on the lists.”

Howard objects to this clause: “…he had great objection to the clause depriving the people that he had been representing for the last four years of the elective franchise. He knew that the late Government proposed to bring in a measure for the same purpose but he had strenuously opposed it. The Manitoba Act gave them the right to vote….The Church Missionary Society which for years has been labouring amongst the Indians represented in that parish, have raised them to appreciate the benefits of an elective franchise and an enactment of this kind will place them in an very unenviable position….

Norquay objected bec. the clause should be a separate bill “and bore out Mr. Howard’s statement that he (Howard) opposed the measure in the late Government…..”

Legisl Council sitting 13 July – on abolishing Leg Council – it was created by QC members who insisted in 1870 that it was “necessary to protect the rights of minorities.”

**MDFP 31 March 1875**

Opening of 1st session of Second Parliament: Morris in Windsor uniform, artillery salute, carriage parades down Main st. in front of many citizens, received at Court House by guard of honour, band plays God Save the Queen, Dubuc elected speaker, first session after recent general election

Enlarge boundary, create municipalities, abolish Leg Council, improve financial terms (with Ottawa), consider route of Pacific railway.

**Editorial – the** mixed system of secret and open voting that now prevails shd be replaced by ballot

**MDFP 2 April 1875** – sitting of 1 April/75: Davis explains 2 cabinet additions: did not have a majority of English-speaking members, thought best to have fair representation, spoke to Opposition, agreed on ends to be achieved, “and the leader of the Opposition with their (the Opposition’s) advice and consent, had accepted a seat in the Cabinet…” at a price of 2 members for $1300/year

Cornish and C P Brown will oppose the Govt.

Norquay defends self – “As leader of the Opposition I was at the head of an element representing only one section of the community of this Province, which gave the Opposition the appearance of a sectional rather than a political Opposition, in fact it looked more like nationality pitted against nationality than anything else. I am willing to be member of an Opposition composed of both sections of the community in this Province when parties will divide on political principles and not on national differences….” Note that JN went for a re-election, and was re-elected.

Luxton said he had a hand in making “the reconstruction of the Government.” The people of my riding supported me at public mtgs.

Martin of Ste Agathe says Luxton and JN were “bitterly opposed” to the Government two months ago but today are part of the govt. He was an Independent. Couldn’t change his views as quickly as those two did.

JN: quotes a statement “I believe by that great statesman John Bright; when he said that an independent was a man on whom neither party could rely. For my part I have had enough of those Independents lately to induce me to steer clear of them in the future and if my honourable friend chooses to play that role he is quite at liberty to do so.”

K McKenzie said he assisted in the reconstruction of the Govt.

Davis notes the Dr. Schultz perjury case….

**MDFP, 3 April 1875: sitting of 1 April** continued: Davis says Luxton, Dick, Brown, and McKenzie helped in reconstructing the govt.

**Sitting of 2 April**; 5 April;

**MDFP 7 April 1875**: 6 April sitting:

7 April sitting (MDFP 8 April) – JJ Setter was paid $155 for court services in W Marquette in January.

Royal speech on bill re elections: Voter qualifications: HM subject, 3 month resident, own real estate of $100 or rent of $20 on property valued at $200. Voting to be by secret ballot – “prevents to a great degree undue influence, corruption and intimidation, and has been productive of good wherever introduced.” May not have been passed?

Luxton spoke in favour of ballot.

**MDFP 9 April 1875 –** 7 April sitting (contd):

Norquay: 7 April sitting:

ballot is best means of stopping corrupt practices. We should profit by England’s experience with it. “Of course much of the bill has been copied from the laws in force in the other Provinces, but that is something not to be regretted. Much of our legislation requires to be the same and I see no reason why we should not avail ourselves of all the help we can get from their experience and assimilate our legislation to theirs, so that one general law shall prevail throughout the Dominion.”

**MDFP 12 April 1875** – 9 April sitting:

**MDFP 13 April 1875 --** 12 April sitting

Election law – JN opposed a restrictive clause on voters, saying “the House had need of all the intelligence that could be obtained no matter where it came from, and held that it was not wise to exclude anyone who is a voter and the choice of the people.”

**MDFP 14 April 1875 --** 13 April sitting – Nolin motion asking GG for prompt action on Half-breed lands; also Luxton motion for resolution to GG that timber be restricted for the use of “actual settlers in the neighbourhood of its growth”

**MDFP 15 April 1875 --** 13 April sitting, 14 April sitting

**MDFP 17 April 1875 --** 16 April sitting – Leg Council message re a message to be sent to GG re “the injury done to private property by Indians in certain localities, and asking now that reserves have been made for them, that proper steps be taken by the Indian Commissioner to have them removed thereon.” Sutherland strongly supported, “giving as reasons the great damage done by Indians to private property, and also that I would remove them out of so much temptation to drinking. Messrs Dick, Royal, and McKenzie opposed, giving as reasons the benefits that the farmers west received from the assistance of the Sioux, and held that the House had no power over the matter. The question was then dropped.”

**Etc**

**MDFP 27 April 1875 --** 26 April sitting – resolution of concern re route of CPR 4 miles below the Stone Fort (eventual site of Selkirk town?) and thence to narrows of L Manitoba, avoiding the “old settled portion” of MB and the newly-settled western sections thereof – better to run “as directly westward as practicable from Rat Portage via Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie to Edmonton….” And, also, that Pembina Branch should cross the Red River to Winnipeg – resolution to be drafted and sent to GG in Council.

Also addresses to be drafted re fed role in construction of public bldgs., and expansion of boundaries.

**MDFP 29 April 1875 --** 28 April sitting – redistribution bill **introduced by Luxton**, who said: “…if the good feeling and good understanding so far exhibited in this House this session, were continued, the conflict of nationalities would soon be a matter of the past.” At the last session a rep by pop bill was found to be “impracticable” and at an “adjourned session a bill was passed which constituted fourteen English and ten French constituencies….” This bill is written “not necessarily to secure proportionate representation in respect of the several electoral divisions; but to secure proportionate representation between the two acknowledged classes.” Not to repeal the present Act, but “to secure proportionate representation between the two parties. This was the only principle to which he adhered.” – 16 English to 8 French “as near as may be a proper representation.” The French ridings contain 1590 voters, English 4715, according to Parl. Companion. He goes through some detailed calculations, to reach a more precise ratio of 1429 to 3285 – therefore 2 seats to 1 was accurate. True, it may never be actually used in an election because newcomers will change the balance. Why do it now? “…the country demanded it as an act of justice…..He only asked justice; he asked the House not to be generous – only just.”

C P Brown and JN oppose as not now necessary – leave until closer to next election – Brown says “he did not approve of the principle of recognizing two distinct classes as laid down in this Bill.” Other elements were now arriving in the province and might demand the same privilege. “He believed in the principle of representation by population for the whole country, and not for sections of it.” Besides, there were many other reasons to require a more complete rejigging of the electoral map. But especially he opposed “the continuation of class legislation….” For example, “If this principle were to be carried out it would be necessary for a certain number of members to be set apart for the Mennonites.” He moved that it was “inexpedient to legislate on the question at the present time….”

“Hon. Mr. Royal spoke in French.”

Martin said Royal’s views met the views of the majority of the House. Luxton isn’t consistent. “The other day Mr. Luxton was depreciating the raising of national prejudices, and yet today he was raising those very feelings.”

JN says all members support rep by pop as principle. It “had been conceded by the French members in the last Parliament.” This bill does not carry out that commitment. Before the next election, the government will pass a proper bill “based upon statistics….Taking this view of the matter, in promises to his constituents he did say that he would support a redistribution bill based upon representation by population; but this bill is not based upon population.” He will support Brown’s amendment to postpone consideration thereof. Brown amdmt carried 14-8. [Bourke, Dick, Davis, Cowan, Cornish, Luxton, McKenzie, Sutherland]

**MDFP 30 April 1875 -- 28 April sitting:** Girard moves second reading of bill to incorporate the Colonization Society of Manitoba – clearly aimed at creating reserve, and that it would appeal to Fr Cdns in US – though Girard said it was aimed at all British subjects who wished to come to Canada.

Dispute over whether locking up more land was a good idea.

Royal: “The members should remember one thing, that although we speak French, we are loyal British subjects, we are in fact the oldest British subjects, and have never given doubts of our loyalty.”

Cornish advocated that “were these reserves all open they would be settled by people of different nationalities, and not exclusively by those of one nation…and that such a result would be better for the interest of the Province.”

“Mr. Martin thought some of the members did not want French people to come to this Province….He approved of classes settling together, because when they left their own country they were glad to see friends. If all the French would settle together they would be able to have their schools, and the English the same. The society would favour all nationalities alike.”

“Mr. Nolin spoke in French.”

Girard did not want to break the good feeling between the two classes in this country – withdrew the bill.

**MDFP 1 May 1875 -- 30 April sitting**: JN moved second reading of bill to abolish Leg Council. Ontario has no upper house. We have no “vested rights to be protected” and “the Lower House was able to deal with all questions that were likely to arise. The constitution of this Province has provided safeguards for the minority. Were there any attempt made to override the minority there is a chance for an appeal to the Federal authorities and we have lately seen several instances where the Federal Government are very careful to protect the rights of the minority.” Norquay said he had worked for this measure in the last Parliament and got a bill through the lower House at that time.

Girard said he had introduced the measure in the last session. And that the Upper House was no protection of the rights of the minority against the majority, since the number of members could be increased, perhaps based on population growth – no protection then.

Lemay opposed – Upper House would check hasty legislation. Cornish opposed too – safeguard to the minority – but accepts Girard as leader of French so will accept his view and vote for bill.

Carried 17-5 [Lemay, Lepine, Martin, McKay, Murray]. Same on 3rd reading.

**MDFP 4 May 1875 – 3 May sitting:** JN introduces 2nd reading of education bill – “The Board continues to recognize the principle of separate schools, nothing else can be done in the meantime. The Dominion Government has recognized it and it has been recognized heretofore and we must continue it for the present.” Allocation of monies is changed: formerly based on division by aggregate attendance; now a census of children in “the school district” aged 5 to 12 [Davis later said 16], and divided “in proportion to the number of children residing in the several districts.”

Luxton regretted this – preferred “thoroughly non-sectarian schools.” The Liberal Ottawa govt had made great mistake in NWT school law – “it would result in disaster. …The principle of church and state ought to be and must be wiped out in all British countries….” He wld accept separate schools for now, “until we could have absolutely secular schools.” He also wanted an amdmt requiring instruction in English in all schools receiving govt support: “Schools should prepare men to battle with the world, and a knowledge of English was indispensable. A knowledge of French is not so….” And division of grants – by attendance, not population.

**MDFP 4 May 1875 – 4 May sitting:** series of amdmts to teach English in French schools – all lost [Cornish, Cowan, Luxton, and sometimes McKenzie and Sutherland in minority] –see below

Halfbreed Land Grant Protection Act returns from Leg Council, and Royal moved concurrence in their amdmt reducing time for notice in Gazette from 6 to 3 months.

**MDFP 10 May 1875 – 8 May sitting:** more re school bill – Cornish: “We had got quite enough of separate schools without making it worse. The sooner we become one people the better.”

JN income in 1875 -- $300 for session, and $2000 as minister **[MDFP 11 May 1875, report on sitting of 10 May/75]**

A caretaker (of the provl govt bldg. presumably) is paid $300.

**MDFP 11 May 1875 –** Kildonan Scandal still hangs over govt., says one member – govt tried to buy an election.

**Sitting of 10 May**: long day: JN defends estimates late in evening –sarcasm in JN’s comments re one critic: “…as matters are not as he would wish he must of course make the government feel the weight of his immense influence against them.” He then discusses the items that raised the critics’ “hottest wrath” – sessional indemnity – could be lowered if the members wish.…”

And, despite charges, the govt did not pay someone to withdraw from Kildonan election. [several members alleged by MFP to be drunk, esp two-hour speech of silliness by member for Poplar Point, but also member for St. Paul – **editorial 13 May MDFP**]

In **MDFP 12 May, 1875 re 11 May sitting,** it is clear Nolin accosted Martin outside House. Nolin apologized for “having taken Mr. Martin by the nose for using insulting language.”

Norquay’s deal upon entering the Cabinet was then discussed until 3:30 in the morning. Cornish, Luxton approached Brown, Brown told the House, urging him “not to oppose the Government, but to give them a fair support upon all good measures.” At this meeting were Norquay, McKenzie and others, as well as Brown, Luxton, Cornish.

Luxton: “The arrangements were that Mr. Norquay was to go into the Government as the representative of the then English opposition; the French members were to select another member, without portfolio, whomsoever they choose. And we were to support that Government upon certain pledges which had been given by Messrs. Davis and Norquay…. They were to support fair English legislation, including a redistribution measure giving 16 English and 8 French seats. And allow me to say that Mr Davis has carried out his pledges to the letter. There was a breach of faith on the part of Mr Norquay and I therefore consider myself freed from any allegiance which I might otherwise have owed the present government. Mr Cornish was the first to break faith in the compact.” Norquay was to resign if “legislation of the government was obnoxious to his party… at their united request.” But, Luxton said, Cornish “demoralized the party by repudiating the whole thing within two days of its consummation.”

Norquay: a redistribution bill “giving16 to 8 was one of the principal features of that reconstruction….” Davis had agreed to this deal. But I did not support the bill that was presented on this basis – “for which I am willing to account to my constituents…” Luxton is free from giving support to the Govt. “as far as I am individually concerned….”

“I was to receive the unanimous support of the party at the time known as the Opposition… [but] what did the first day of the session develop; merely this, Mr Speaker, that the hon. member for Poplar Point was the first person to repudiate by his action the understanding arrived at at [sic] the time of the reconstruction, and I leave it to this House to say whether I was not then released from my obligation.”

**MDFP 13 May, 1875, re 12 May sitting:**

Royal “explained that he was met at the foot of the stairs by a person named Thibaudeau who applied to him (Royal) an epithet no gentleman would submit tamely to, and he therefore placed his signature on that person’s face.”

Estimates: “The Clarke administration” spent $120,000 per year in roughly 1871-1873 and about $90,000 in 6 months of 1874. Davis expects to spend $84,000 in all of 1875.

Martin of Ste Agathe was subject of motion of censure “for his disorderly conduct in the House.” He apologized. Luxton said Martin had wasted several days of sitting time, and that “one or two other members of the House [should also be censured for]…. such disgraceful scenes had never occurred in the annals of Canada.”

Royal encouraged House to accept apology.

“Hon. Mr Norquay hoped the House would be generous and not blight the prospects of a young man just starting in life and who had been partly led astray by older members who were perhaps more deserving of censure….”

Davis regretted members “get up in the House and disgrace themselves, the House, and the country. They had come there pumped full of whiskey and besides the disgrace had retarded the business of the House to a very serious extent….”

[Who? Member for St. Paul, for one, said Mr Dick]

**MDFP 14 May, 1875 re 13 May sitting:**

Prorogue – parade etc.

Royal Assent to Half Breed Land Grant Protection Act cap 46, Vic 37

**MDFP 18 January, 1876 re 18 January 1876 sitting: [18 Jan to 4 February 1876]**

Opening, Govt House to Court House (Parliament Hall), delightful weather, many turned out to witness the procession. Speech from Throne started with grasshoppers, bad for three years but especially 1875 – held “a day of public humiliation and prayer” to avert the locusts’ return. Feds agree to supply $60,000 for relief – grain and provisions bought, committee distributes supplies. Govt appealed to Ottawa for more subsidy, accepted increase to $90,000 each year to 1881. Leg Council to be abolished.

**MDFP 21 January, 1876 re 20 January 1876 sitting:**

Nolin was asked why he resigned in December. He replied that he made demands in the interest of the Metis and the govt refused. He wld support govt in passing good measures, but as an independent.

Royal: Nolin demanded that 4 officers of court and leg be dismissed, replaced by Metis, and that newly-vacant offices be filled by Metis, rather than “Lower Canadian French” as was now happening

**MDFP 29 January, 1876 re 28 January 1876 sitting**

Accounts – sum expended in 1875: $86,377. Estimate for 1876: $77,000

Sioux: Luxton moved that address to GG be prepared “praying for the immediate removal of the Sioux Indians within this Province, to their reserves, as such Indians are a continual annoyance to the settlements, by reason of their pillaging and other evil habits….”

License Act – liquor law – debate over clause preventing grocery stores outside Winnipeg from selling liquor. Mr. Lemay would vote against the motion and suggested an addition to the clause: “that no person be allowed to get drunk except in Winnipeg (laughter).” “A most exciting scene ensued” in the assembly, “members gathered in knots and gesticulated fiercely, and so great was the confusion the remarks of the speakers could not be heard. Hon. Mr. Norquay said he would move that the committee rise and report and ask leave to sit again as he did not think the committee were calm enough to vote on the question. This proposition was met by cries of ‘no, no’….” and the House soon adjourned, the matter unresolved.

**MDFP 3 February, 1876 re 2 February 1876 sitting**

**Estimates for year ending 30 June 1877:**

Cabinet members $2000; Deputy Ministers $1200; Clerks of Dept $500;

John F. Grant “for amount allowed for damages sustained in law expenses etc, by the purchase of a certain horse from the Government of Manitoba through ex-Attorney-General Clarke: $800.” – a matter “caused by the illegal actions” of Clarke. Dr. Cowan noted this issue, and hoped “this would be the last of the horse (laughter).”

Mr St. John and *The Standard* have been publishing inaccuracies, says Davis.

**MDFP 3 February, 1876 re 31 January 1876 sitting of Legislative Council:**

**Re Sioux Indians**: removal to their reserve, their being represented “to be a nuisance to the settlers living in the west. Hon. Mr. McKay hope that the promoters of the motion would guarantee to the House than in the event of the removal of the Indians some provision for sustaining them should be made. It would never do to bundle them off to a bleak reserve this time of year without giving them the means of sustaining life….There had, he believed, been a provision made for these Indians; and he warned hon. gentlemen that they must be dealt with like men – as all the Indians in the country had been dealt with by the Government. Treating Indians in any other way would only drive them to commit such desperate acts as they had frequently been accused of across the line. It was said that these Sioux Indians had become a nuisance and were plundering; but the statement was, to say the least of it, doubtful. Red Indians had very often to bear the blame of outrages committed by white Indians. Ever since these Sioux came here in 1864 he had, while acting as agent for the authorities, been brought into almost daily contact with them and every effort had been made to move them out of the country. He had been one of three commissioners appointed by the Governor-in-Council, who had done what they could to induce these Sioux to leave, but at that time the people of the Portage would not allow the Indians to go. It would, no doubt, be very desirable that these and all the other Indians should be removed to their reserves.”

“Hon. Mr. McKay said that the Dominion Government had dealt with the Sioux Indians in the most liberal spirit. They had given them reserves to which they were not entitled, and even changed these reserves several times. Last summer a number of the Sioux went to their reserve, but had been frightened off by grasshoppers, and then asked the Lieut. Governor if they might not come lower down along the borders of the lake, so as to get a living. Their request was complied with, and a number of these Indians were there now. In the way of provisions, too, the Government had been liberal – giving them last fall thirty bags of flour, ten bags of pemmican, about eighty pounds of powder, and about one hundred pounds of shot. The fact is these Indians are badly off for clothes and food.”

**MDFP 4 February, 1876 re 4 February 1876 sitting**

Aboln of upper house – Lt Gov in Throne Speech closing the sitting – trusts that Assembly “will act with the utmost deliberation and care, so that the results of this experiment, may prove that all classes and sections of our people may count, as it has been in the past, on being dealt with, with generosity and British justice, ….”

**MDFP 7 February, 1876 – Editorial:** “…the Session …has wrought a change in our Constitution, by the abolition of the Legislative Council.” The English favoured it, the French long opposed, but finances and Fed Govt suggestion made it happen. And of reasons for giving up the chamber, the former opponents cited the shortcomings of the Leg Council and “the professions of liberality made by the English-speaking representatives upon the floor of the House”

Municipal election act prohibits sale or giving away on municipal election days of intoxicating liquors.

**MDFP 30 January, 1877, sitting of 30 Jan.**

Throne speech: Abundant harvest, railway progress will soon link MB to L Superior, incorpn of towns, U of M bill, address to GG re allotment of halfbreed lands to expedite their right of use, smallpox in Keewatin….

JN spoke in the debate on the reply: he noted “the policy enunciated by the Government had been, so far, universally endorsed. (Cheers).”

On redistribution: “The Government were always anxious to meet the growing requirements of the Province, but were not at all anxious to endorse any buncombe resolution proposed by members merely to curry favour with their constituents (laughter and cheers). He defied any member of the House to show that the Government had ever shirked their duty in meeting the growing requirements of the Province of which they were the executive body (cheers).”

He defended the U of M plan – better that people not be forced to travel to the older provinces – “but should have facilities for this purpose offered them here (cheers).”

Halfbreed land grants – allotment should immediately follow the drawing, “so as to enable those to whom this 240 acre grant had been given to become the guardians of their own property. At present the reserves were a sort of commonwealth – no one looked after them because no one had a special right to do so. Consequently the lands were going to ruin, and what might otherwise prove a very valuable patrimony was being wasted (hear and cheers). He ended to cheers.

Davis spoke at length to end the debate.

**MDFP 10 February, 1877, sitting of 9 February 1877**

Cornish asked for all correspondence with Feds re disallowance of MB Act passed in 38 Vic, Chap 37, entitled an act to amend Cap.46, 36 Vict. The Half-breed Land Grant Protection Act. The Act was passed three years ago, and amended at the session before the last, rec’d Royal assent, but had been disallowed by Dom Govt – wished to know how this could happen – province passed act but had no power to amend it: “he wished to see if their reasons for the disallowance were logical.” Carried w/o opposn.

Lemay asked why salaries of registrar and clerk of county courts had been cut from $500 to $400. “And said that is was less than he paid to his hostler….less than an ordinary labourer.”

Davis said it was an economy measure – ministers had reduced their own salaries and of their clerks, etc, but that measure expired at the end of 1876.

Re U of M: Govt think the act premature, but have been pressed, and now is trying to meet the view of the different parties seeking its establishment. Will only grant degrees, not be a teaching institution, but chairs may later be attached and endowed, and it may begin to teach.

**MDFP 15 February, 1877, sitting of 14 February 1877**

Motion based on rumours that E.B.Wood, Chief Justice of MB, “while on his way to and from the County Court of Marquette, was in a helpless state of intoxication, and also that the court had to be deferred to another day owing to the same cause….” To investigate etc – not proceeded with.

Second reading of a bill entitled “An Act to repeal an act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty’s reign, Chap. 46, entitled: The Half Breed land grant protection act…” Cornish of Poplar Point believed Ottawa had slighted MB, and he wanted the correspondence on the issue by Friday “and if the Government will not then bring it down, they had better resign and let better men fill their position.”

**MDFP 16 February, 1877, sitting of 15 February 1877**

Correspondence tabled – Cabinet minutes (extract) of 18 November 1876, sent to Sec of State, Ottawa, “With regard to the half-breeds lands to be allotted to the children, under the Manitoba Act, the Council would urgently urge that so soon as the lands reserved for a parish or township are drawn and allotted public announcement thereof should be made, in order that children of full age to whom lands have been allotted may have the opportunity of settling upon them and that the parents or guardians of minors may have the opportunity of protecting any timber that may exist upon the land. They are aware of many young men who are anxiously awaiting the pronouncement of the lots that have fallen to them, in order that they may settle upon the land if it be suitable.

“They are also of opinion that the children of full age should have the right to sell the land allotted to them, so soon as the allotment has been made and confirmed without awaiting the issue of the patents owing to the length of time that will be occupied before the issue can take place.”

The federal cabinet replied on 19 January 1877 that this was federal matter, would receive careful attention….

**MDFP 20 February, 1877, sitting of 19 February 1877**

A return re provl apptmts with name, nationality religion, salary, date of apptmt:

Clarke Admin: 8 Prot, 10 Catholics (of whom 6 French);

David Admin: 27 Prot, 13 Catholics (of whom 8 French).

**MDFP 21 February, 1877, sitting of 20 February 1877**

Re Halfbreed land act amendment: Davis: “…the object of the bill was to amend the old Act so that it would give satisfaction to the greatest number.” The grant originally contemplated a grant of 140 acres, then 190 acres. “It would not be just to compel a man who sold his right thinking he was entitled to 140 acres to give a deed for 240. The bill as he introduced it allowed all old transactions to be governed by the old Act. He thought the existing statute wrong, but it would be equally unjust to many parties to repeal it without any provisos, and two wrongs did not make a right. He hoped the promoter of the other bill would withdraw it.”

JN seconded the above. “…the act was not intended to place a barrier between the parties but to remove one which already existed. When the bill was up for its second reading, it was asserted that the existing was, as it were, an inducement to be dishonest. Such had been his conviction at the time of the passage of the act, and such might have been the case today, had he not seen that some people took advantage of half-breeds who sold their claims from necessity. It was unreasonable to force a man to sell 240 acres of land which is worth one, two and even four dollars an acre for twenty-five dollars and in a few cases the enormous sum of fifty dollars.”

Cornish said his bill wld be better, had explained in the Free Press, but wld withdraw his bill if this new bill were amended to come into force immediately.

JN spoke “at some length [no details] supporting the delay.” [to 1 July]

**Evening sitting:**

“After a very spirited debate, in which most of the members took part…” Cornish moved that it take effect immediately, lost 15 – 6 [Brown, Cornish, Cowan, Howard, Martin, McKenzie]

A second recorded vote on the h’b land protection act was 13-7 (Sutherland added to opponents).

JN “called the attention of the member for Poplar Point that every half-breed member in the House voted against the bill.”

Third reading passed [MDFP 23 February, 1877, sitting of 22 February 1877]

**FP editorial “The Session of 1877” 28 Feb 1877:** the halfbreed lands act – “after the 1st of July next all transactions will be binding.”

**MDFP 22 February, 1877, sitting of 21 February 1877**

JN moves second reading of redistribution bill: “…the prime object of its promoters had been to give to every party represented in the Province a just representation – that is, with regard to interests and elements. While making certain provisions deducting from the numbers of those supposed to be more than represented on the floor of the House, provision had to be made by this bill to enable those supposed to be unfairly represented to get their just dues (cheers). It would be seen that there had been the least possible interference with existing arrangements….The bill in his hands did not pretend to give representation by population – that is, it did not provide a representation purely based on numbers, as between individual members and constituencies, but had reference more especially to interests and elements…. a full representation had been accorded to the old residents of the Province – who were, as hon. members were aware – the pioneers of the country (cheers). He stood there as the representative of that element, and maintained that it was nothing but fair that they should be amply represented (hear, hear).” The old settlers had “always been liberal towards the new settlers… And now that the numbers and wealth of the newcomers would bring about a new era, this attitude of the old settlers would no doubt be remembered to their advantage (cheers).”

5 of the “outlying districts” wld be represented in the House; 3 other electoral divisions “should be under the control of the new English element – this would give “the new element …a representation of eight. For the old English residents a representation of eight had also been provided – thus placing both on an equal footing. Eight other constituencies had been accorded to what was usually known as the French element….

“…he personally had been charged with the framing of its provisions….[they] were, he believed, just and equitable in the extreme….”

Dr. Cowan: we were supposed to have population numbers and voters lists – this bill has been prepared w/o either – “as a plan to reconcile opposing interests and elements, this might be all very good, but in principle it was decidedly wrong. Representation by population, irrespective of any class or creed, he believed to be the correct principle (cheers from the gallery)….[Nothing was done to make an enumeration and now we have a scheme based on “interests and elements – more especially, he supposed, on interests (laughter).”

McKenzie – “If we were to be a prosperous, we must be a united people and our differences must not be perpetuated by legislation.”

Cornish – some ridings have 90 or 100 electors, some have 300, 600, 800, 1000 – that’s not equitable. He opposed class legislation – “to have class pulling against class and that each of these diversified interests and elements must be represented….every trade and even religion… (laughter)….” He objected to the “gerrymandering…to wipe out the constituencies of two of the Opposition members, at all events – the members for High Bluff and Poplar Point….” – [the latter is his own]

Luxton: approved JN’s remarks “in the main….” Re critics: “they demand the ignoring of classes and legislation for the whole people….[they] seem to forget that the whole is made up of its parts, and that in legislating for one, they legislate for the other also.” The outlying districts are 3 – Springfield, Westbourne, Rockwood [his own]. In future Burnside, Pembina added. Plus “equitable representation as between the French and English elements in the country (cheers).” 16 English, 8 French (and 8 of 16 will be new settlers).

**MDFP 23 February, 1877, sitting of 22 February 1877**: Lemay supported the bill – and talk of 2 seats for Wpg – “the fact was that city was already too much represented (laughter). One-third of the representatives sitting in that House were residents of Winnipeg (laughter).”

Third reading passed by 15-5 [Brown, Cornish, Cowan, Martin, McKenzie] [FP 27 Feb, sitting of 26 Feb]

**1878**

**MDFP 10 January 1878, sitting of 10 January**

Opening – sgt at arms Alex Begg [he’s also Queen’s Printer], Cauchon as LG – his “recent and sad affliction…”-- bereavement – Mrs. C’s demise; abundant harvest; need for railway; consolidation of statutes

12 Jan 1878: 11 January sitting – Chenier moved address in reply, saw need for rly for farm exports – “It was a question of life and death for the whole North-West….” He was happy to hear ballot wld be abolished, and the “more manly, the more satisfactory, the more moral and more dignified system of open voting” wld return. Ballot had not reduced corruption….

**MDFP 19 January 1878, sitting of 18 January 1878**

JN on Ballot: MB doesn’t have large manufactories where an employer might control many votes. The people have expressed a preference “for the more manly system of open voting.” He had favoured the ballot three years ago but we had “a practical test” in St. Paul (“a contested election”): “It was a remarkable fact that every one of the four candidates in St. Paul’s had received such promises from the electors that he had felt quite sure of being elected by a substantial majority….” There were safeguards against corruption other than the ballot. “…here, where the older residents were new to experience of representative institutions, not all the electors were educated up to the degree of political intelligence required to enable them to comprehend the advantages claimed for the working of this system.”

Cornish said the Minister of Public Works said “that the people were very ignorant….

JN objected: “he had not said that the people were too ignorant, but that they were not sufficiently acquainted with the working of the machinery of representative institutions…” in the case of St. Paul’s parish.

Later JN spoke again: “…one of the greatest British privileges was that of being able to speak out one’s mind….” People in St. Paul’s had promised each candidate to vote for him. “The ballot might secure the secrecy of a vote and its independence, but at what sacrifice? – of honour and manliness….” Not wise to jump “too soon” to a new system of voting: “Now, while enjoying the right of open voting for the Provincial Legislature, the people would have the opportunity of getting accustomed to the ballot system as employed for the elections for the House of Commons.”

Luxton spoke next and agreed with JN, though in the abstract he favoured the ballot.

Royal also had concluded it was premature here – “it was no use to put the clothes of a full grown man on a boy of ten.” Passed second reading w/o opposing votes.

**MDFP 25 January 1878, sitting of 24 January 1878** – bill to regulate tolls of mills, introduced by Sutherland, who favoured 1/6th toll (miller takes the sixth bushel).

JN “when he saw the effects of passing such a measure would only be to press the yoke harder upon the farmer, it would be better to vote it down; if the millers had accepted bonuses and had built mills in the settlements, and were then guilty of extortion, the Government would be justified in interfering, but where the mill owners were private speculations, it would be in defiance of all principle.” He opposed the bill.

Brown said they should not interfere with “the sacred rights of property.”

Lemay outlines economics of labour in the mill – v good.

**MDFP 30 January 1878, sitting of 29 January 1878** – amdmt to “act respecting the protection of game,” re exempting ducks from the operations of the act. JN suggested a proviso “that the clauses of the old act with reference to the collection and sale of wild duck’s eggs remain in full force and effect.”

**MDFP 1 February 1878, sitting of 29 January 1878**

Davis’ major speech in defence of his administration over past 3 years – strong statement

**MDFP 2 February 1878, sitting of 29 January 1878**

Davis noted that members had been accustomed to retire to the Speaker’s chamber for cigars and drinks “whenever they saw fit.” He and the Speaker were tired of having to pay “$200 or $300 or more every session out of their private pockets to pay these expenses.” They told the sgt at arms not to continue the practice, but members having asked him “for liquor and cigars, naturally supposed they would repay him for them.” They did not – so the items appear in the public accounts “so that the country could see how the money had been used.” It averages to 55 cents per day per member – nearly 3 twenty-cent cigars

**1879 session**

Opened 1 Feb1879 – with Throne Speech [see notes in NPPapers]

**4 Feb sitting** - Norquay moved an address of sympathy to Her Most Gracious Majesty respecting the death of the Princess Alice. The event “had cast a gloom over all the subjects of the Empire.” In this expression, “the House would appropriately recognize the bond of union existing in this respect; and their action would, he felt sure, be appreciated in this light.”

-Norquay moved for an address to new gg, the Marquis of Lorne, on his arrival: “A distinguished honour had been conferred on the people of the Dominion by the appointment of… Her Majesty’s son-in-law…”

-Norquay moved an address expressing the pleasure of Manitobans in the late administration of Lord Dufferin. His visit to MB would “in no small degree tend to strengthen those feelings of loyalty and devodtion whch had ever characterized Her Majesty’s subjects here.”

**5 Feb sitting**-much talk of drainage.

- Mr. Ross in Throne Speech debate “congratulated the Premier as a native of this Province, on his accession to that important position; …”

**6 Feb sitting:** Norquay jokes (in reply to a complaint from Dr. Cowan that no members of the opposition had been placed on the standing committees) – Norquay thought, judging from their speeches, that “they were all supporters of the Government (laughter).” He had no problem with a change, “assuring [Cowan] that full justice would be accorded the Opposition members, if any one would only designate them (laughter). If he knew them, he would be most happy to put in a good sprinkling (laughter).”… “Hon Mr. Norquay (laughing) said he had no objection at that stage to accept the names of the two members suggested.”

Much talk of new settlements and need for more schools.

Throne speech reply – amendment on schools defeated 14-9. [opposed: Scott, Sutherland, Drummond, Stevenson, Lusted, Cowan, McKenzie, Ross, Biggs]

**7 Feb sitting: Nolin resolution:** seed grain debts and mortgages related thereto should be discharged by federal govt. Delorme supported. Cancel the obligation.

Norquay amended it to ask the feds to accept grain and provisions equal to that advanced to them (prices of grain had fallen since the loans had been made 5 years earlier). Defeated. Original motion was carried by vote of 13-9.

**First day of resumed sitting recorded in LLM collection: *Times* mentioned where used:**

**Tuesday 27 May 1879 –** Session re-opened, 3 members absent only. Speaker J. W. Sifton

***Times* 27 May 1879 *–*** Norquay promised legislation re ballot (in reply to Scott’s question)

**Wednesday**  - regular business

***Times*** – **27 May 1879** Norquay will introduce a bill to incorporate St. John’s College ladies school.

**Thursday 29 May**[]: “Manitoba Legislature” [title of article] “It began to be known on the streets yesterday morning that all was not comfortable with the Manitoba Government as now constituted, and the knowing ones gave expression to such significant remarks as ‘Well, you will see for yourself.’…. ‘The Local Government is busted’ was a common remark on the streets by noon today and long before the hour of the meeting of the House, three o’clock, the terms of the compromise were freely and full discussed on the street corners, so far as they were known to the public….At first it would seem that the Honourable Premier was completely at sea, but those who know him best did not hesitate to say that when the basked had been fully shaken up he would be in the plae of the ‘big fish.’… Mr. Speaker took the chair at 3 o’clock, at which time a large and excited cxrowd were anxiously waiting at the door of the Parliament building, and when the doors were thrown open, the gallery was filled to overflowing in a few minutes.”

Norquay, in reply to La Riviere question, said that changes had taken place in the government, and one honourable member had submitted his resignation from Cabinet and it had been accepted.

Norquay and Royal disagreed briefly over the cause of the resignation, both agreeing that papers from His Honour, The Administrator [Lt Gov being absent] would clarify the circumstances.

Regular business continued, including the government’s intention to drain the Seine River, given the very wet season.

**Friday, 30 May:**  Debate over a bill on juries, Royal’s amendment defeated 13-6. Norquay tabled papers re Royal’s resignation. [***Times*** – **31 May 1879 re Friday sitting on 30 May –** Spence read the papers in English, Provencher in French] Then JN asked to postpone discussion thereon until there was time for all members to speak, and moved adjournment. Carried. “The galleries of the House were crowded during the afternoon, and the greatest interest in the proceedings was manifested by the occupants.”

**Monday 2 June: a 30 minute sitting.** Re vacant seat of Ste. Anne: Judge Betournay’s judgment and his report thereon were tabled. [published in Monday’s *Times.]* A writ must be issued forthwith. Norquay then moved adjournment. House adjourned at 4:00.

**Tue, 3 June sitting (3:30**): another brief session – 25 minutes. Norquay said that he had now accepted the resignation of Delorme and would explain tomorrow the government’s intentions.

**Wed. 4 June: new cabinet**-- “a handsome saving might be effected by largely reducing the French printing, and cutting down as much as possible the expenditures in English printing also.” Plus redistribution. Plus bdy extension. And “a more careful distribution of the money appropriated for school purposes.” [LLM]

Royal asks for explanation why principle of cabinet formation maintained previously had been abandoned?

Norquay – see correspondence between Royal and myself – published, he says. French members of cabinet expressed dissatisfaction, threatened to withdraw, wanted English majority supporting govt. I knew Royal would not be acceptable to English in House. But “while well aware of this fact I was prepared – and my colleagues agreed with me – loyally to stand or fall by this gentleman. Then the crisis came. The French supporters of this gentleman… became dissatisfied without cause, and hence the change. … The English members are a unit…. I regretted very much the necessity for making this change.”

Royal: why has the principle on which previous governments had been formed been abandoned? when Davis resigned, the French accepted Norquay as the nominee of the English supporters in the House. This was “a compact.” I instituted a charge of libel against the man pressing claims against me. But we were flooded with railway legislation, and it was best to go to Ottawa to “be in harmony with …the parliament of Canada.” We have had a double majority system in place since 1871.

Royal: go back to October 1878. Davis was going to resign. “The party to which I belong” believed I had a “good” claim to the title of premier but an election was coming, and “in this Province where plrejudice ran high… it would be unwise to press the claim although they were convinced of its justice. We agreed to accept the choice of our English friends as leader of the Government. Mr. Norquay was selected. We, of course, intimated also our wish that in the abinet then formed, the men selected on our side should be such as commanded the support of a majority of their section, and that the same principle should guide the selections of those representing the English speaking element.” The English broke the compact. “All the members of my party were elected.” This despite the abuse heaped on me. – “slanders” – but they did affect results in some degree in the rest of the province. But Norquay and two cabinet members had “only two supporters (laughter) that is to say, they had not even a supporter each.” Norquay had five months to come to me, say that my presence prevented his continuing. I “repeatedly called his attention” to the need for greater English support and he agreed with me.”

I instituted proceedings for libel against the man who spread these rumours. Then, late in the day, the premier asked me to go to Ottawa, though he “knew well that this trial of mine was to go to a jury in March.” [this was only ten or twelve days before the trial would have occurred.] We returned, after success in Ottawa, and I again suggested the need for greater support. The premier “charged one of his colleagues to see a member of the House” and to my further inquiry, he replied that our success in Ottawa would win sufficient votes. “my party … were dissatisfied with the obstinacy of the leader of the Government.” On the 28th our party met and asked me to go again to the premier. He agreed with me and said a dying member would support him but couldn’t come to vote, “being unable to leave his sick bed (laughter). And so matters dragged on.” And then he “rushed into the arms of those who had opposed him most strongly during the last five years.”

The premier broke the “cardinal principle” of the previous eight years. Yet here we were – “a minority insisting on justice for a majority.” Should we move to party system? “It is not for me to say.” But is the present government the best that could be obtained? Norquay promised to respect French rights – we cannot rely on him to keep his word.

We are “expelled because we are French Canadians – because our language is French…” yet we “entertain no ill feeling towards any member of this House.”

**Norquay:** “The principle that legislation should keep pace with the progress of the country is undeniable.” The province had changed over the past eight years, thousands had arrived here and were not fully represented. Norquay said he knew well that the presence of one member of cabinet made it impossible for the govt to obtain the support of a majority “of the English members of the House. This fact had been told to me repeatedly.” When the government was formed in Nov 1878, he had been aware of a “passing remark” in which it was set out that “each party in the Cabinet should command the support of a majority of their party” – not “an acknowledged, well-defined principle.” – By insisting on a double majority principle [Royal]: “he is going a little too far.” It was “desirable,” yes. But this was thrust on me. “I regretted very much the necessity for making this change.” But I contemplate no unfair changes to the circumstances of the French. Printing had cost $83000 – in last 8 years – needs to be reduced. Redistribution of electoral divisions – not in platform or Throne Speech but had to be done at some point because of immigration. And my principle – “Where there is an English majority the French minority will be handsomely treated and need fear nothing (cheers in the galleries).”

**Wed. 4 June[continued]:** **Royal compared Norquay** to the King of Belgium in 1848 – when the people called for a republic, he threw open his window and joined the crowd in shouting for a republic. (Laughter). Norquay had known about the printing for five years and said nothing – now he says, “down with the printing.” (Laughter).

**Thursday 4 June: [debate continued]: Norquay e**nded the debate with an observation about Metis-ness: Royal had lamented that he, Norquay, had been the author of these events. “Indeed there may be room for congratulation in the fact of a native of the country showing hmself equal to the occasion and doing his share to help forward the progress of events.” And the French will have “justice … given them in ample measure.”

**FP 12 June 1879: --** followed by discussion of a draft bill to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath – Norquay was one among several who condemned hunting on Sundays. [FP 12 June 1879]

**4th Parliament, First Session, 22 Jan – 14 Feb 1880:**

Financial shortfall and the need for roads and drainage dominated the session. The Legislative Assembly had changed in character. It was now much more focused on development, meaning transportation facilities and what today would be called infrastructure. Even municipal organization focused on such improvements, typically through the maintenance of roads.

Brown moved bill to incorporate the Westbourne and North-Western Railway.[FP: 4 Feb 1880] Carried 3rd reading on 5 Feb 1880.

Also dredging to improve navigation of rivers, boundary extension or provincial enlargement.

**FP- LLM, 11Feb 1880:** **Boundary or Provincial Enlargement:** Norquay explained… Why was Manitoba so small? Perhaps 100 by 140 miles. “The Council of Assiniboia by which the country had been governed, only possessed jurisdiction over the country within a radius of 50 miles from Fort Garry. The Ottawa Government of that day did not like to go outside the range of country included in this district, fearing to incorporate in the new province more territory than that over which law had obtained already, both in civil and criminal cases. To do otherwise, might have led to complications with Indians who then claimed title over the whole North-West.” But now was the time to expand. We need the money. Immigrants are going outside our present limits. The subsidy must count them as part of our responsibility. We need more representatives and influence in Parliament. “Someone had been called sanguine for saying that within a quarter of a century the voting power of the Dominion will be west of Lake Superior; but he did not know that that day might come even sooner than he anticipated.” It was growing rapidly in population now. On 13 Feb. JN made clear that he expected an enlargement of boundaries would be accompanied by “a complete readjustment of our financial position.” [**FP 14 Feb 1880**

**Alcohol**: Norquay defended an act re the licensing of the sale of liquor, in the form of beer and ale only. He argued that these drinks were less harmful than stronger liquor. Greenway opposed all liquor sales. JN returned to the bill on **FP 13 Feb 1880**, wishing to address those “who were addicted to the vice of drunkenness.” This was a new course for legislators: “It was presumed that the downward course was not always so rapid that those treading these paths have no shame left.” The bill “provided that any person, convicted before any justice of the peace, of habitual drunkenness, should be publicly interdicted from the use of liquor, and proper notices of the fact given. There was also a provision for the removal of the interdict in case of reformation. He moved the Bill in all sincerity believing that it would do more good than all the license laws which surrounded the liquor seller.” **Including “act to interdict certain persons from the use of intoxicating liquors.” 14 Feb 1880.**

Also an act “for the deepening of **the outlet of Lake Manitoba into Lake Winnipeg** to prevent the overflowing of the farms located on the banks of the former….” [discussed again 23 May 1881]

**FP-LLM, 13 Feb 1880: municipal govt** in order to improve roads – JN took an active part in the debate, defending what he argued was fairness across the whole province.

**FP-LLM 14 Feb 1880: Budget** estimates of $203,000. JN spoke the language of “the wonderful progress of the [Manitoba] country – larger budget, more services provided by govt. Won cheers and laughter in referring to the increase in legislators’ stipends to $400.

**Prorogation on 14 Feb 1880, with LtGov assent to various bills. Including “act to interdict certain persons from the use of intoxicating liquors.”**

**4th Parliament, second session, 16-23 December 1880:**

Adjourned 23 December 1880. [MFP 3 March 1881 Throne Speech of next session, a special session of the assembly]

**4th Parliament, third session, 3-4 March 1881 and 2 May – 25 May 1881:**

**FP-LLM 4 March 1881: Speech from the Throne – to take into account boundary extension and other measures**

Debate on reply – much congratulation of selves on expansion – millions of acres “of the finest land in the Northwest, and better still, including as he had been informed, the bulk of the settlement to the west” [Mr. A. M. Sutherland speaking in moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne]

The House was adjourned on 4 March, having dealt with the bill on extension.

**FP-LLM 2 May 1881: sitting resumed:** only 13 members present

Amendments of laws to extend Manitoba’s jurisdiction and legislation to cover the new territories thus replacing federal laws.

**Ontario-MB boundary:** we don’t know where it should lie – whether “at the Lake of the Woods, as some maintain, or still farther east, at Thunder Bay – I do not say. That matter will be determined for us….” MFP, 9 May 1881. So the assembly will not provide for the election of a member from Rat Portage until the bdy is known.

**FP-LLM 13 May 1881** **JN introduces** new schools legislation, drafted by the Catholic and Protestant members of the Board of Education – “the principle of separate schools has been fully recognized” – RC ratepayers support the Catholic schools, Protestant schools will be supported by Protestant ratepayers. Provincial grants will be apportioned in Prot and RC school districts in accordance with the number of children of school age in the district.

**FP-LLM 13 May 1881** JN tabled report of provincial delegation to Ottawa re claims of MB on the Dominion.

**4th Parliament, fourth session, 27 April 1882 and 30 May 1882:**

**FP-LLM: 27 April:** First meeting since enlargement – 2 new members present, John W. Sifton and Mr. Alexander. Five new constituencies. And new member for North Dufferin, Dr. Wilson because the elected MPP, McLaughlin, had “accepted office” (Registrarship)

27 april 1882: Throne Speech – good harvest – best ever. Queen escaped from “the hands of the assassin” – thank “the Author of all good for averting so terrible a calamity.” Also sympathy to “the people of the neighbouring Republic” on death of “their elected ruler.”

Very modest legislative agenda.

McMicken is speaker. Spence is clerk of the House. A number of members not present. Greenway suggested postponing sitting due to “unavoidable absence.” Norquay opposed – let’s deal with important business.

**FP-LLM: 1 May:** Long speech from Greenway – can’t read this copy. Check disk? [North Dufferin]. His resolution essentially delared non-confidence in the Norquay govt. – as C.P. Brown said, it “forced Dominion politics on the House.” [FP 8 May, sitting of 4 May Thursday]

Hay [St. Clements]: “regretted deeply to find that party politics were creeping into that House and was surprised to find the Premier venturing to sanction even the intimation of such a thing…. The Province needed united action against any policy such as the N.P… a policy under which nearly everything was taken from us with nothing being given in return. It may be designed to build up manufacturing interests. But… this was essentially an agricultural and not a manufacturing country.” And we have given away “millions of acres of the public domain …for a paltry $45,000 per annum…. Our magnificent landed heritage. (hear) It was ours.” Donald Smith had said we would enter Confederation on the same basis as the other provinces. Cartier understood that. “The Ottawa government now takes away one of the most valued rights we had. Hear Hear.” He then attacked the disallowance policy. [the South Eastern Rly issue] “The people of this country were exasperated. And if ever trouble arose on account of the disregard of our best interests shown by the Ottawa Government, he ventured to say that the ending would be very different from that of a few years ago. (Oh, oh, and hear, hear.) There was yet another course to be pursued to get out of the present difficulty. It was an unpleasant one. (Oh, oh.) But the day may dawn in Manitoba when we may have to come to that one.

A member – What one?

Mr. Hay – Shouldering the musket – if found necessary. (Hear and laughter.)”

Greenway led this condemnation of the disallowance in an earlier speech. McMillan supported him, deplored party feeling being introduced but condemned disallowance.

**FP-LLM: 2 May 1882**: Norquay spoke “at much length.” He noted that “a great ado has been made about the introduction of party lines into this House.” He opposed the introduction of “party issues … that do not affect the interests of the country.” He said in 1879 election that MB could not afford to be hostile to any party in power. He steered clear of partisanship. This was “the old story over again” of the wolf and the lamb, and the opposition was the wolf, determined to quarrel, and “the unfortunate Government, poor lamb (loud laughter) having to suffer. (hear).”

Lands? MB was placed on a different footing than the other provinces. “when I go East what do I find? … [public men] look upon this as an inferior Province – tell us that our lands have been purchased, and we are hindered on all hands instead of being helped. (Hear, hear).” Why should MB and NW shoulder the cost of the CPR?

But these policies have been adopted to meet a “temporary emergency. And that it is perfectly understood by the Government below that they will meet the exigencies of the Province as circumstances warrant. (Hear, hear and cheers).” **FP-LLM: 2 May 1882**

“Yesterday the statement was made that because I was a native of the country I ought to have taken a special part in defending public interests. Well, I think I have taken such a part. But I hope the day will come when we will all – old settlers as well as newcomers – unite in advancing the public welfare…(cheers).”

We got a 5th MP granted to MB.

Disallowance: the matter of the SE Rly -- “My own interpretation of the powers granted to provinces is that provinces, for local purposes, have the power of building and operating railways, but that where the railways are intended to go to the boundary and connect with a line of railway beyond – either to another province, or to foreign territory – that then the jurisdiction of the province ceases….” The BNA Act, S. 92, S 10, a-c, “expressly excluded” this power. Greenway should “study the constitution of the province a little.”

In 1879, it is true, Royal and I assented “to enact no railway legislation” in order that local lines here not conflict with the CPR route. “It was suggested in the course of the discussion that until the Government had laid down the route of the C. P. R, it was desirable that the Province should enact no railway legislation. To this my colleague and myself consented – believing that it would not be right that the railway legislation of this Province should conflict with that projected in the interests of the Dominion. (Hear). Great stress has since been laid on the consent we then gave. It has been said that the Premier himself was the first to abnegate the rights of this Province…. I state here most positively, Mr. Speaker, that, in view of the change taking place, and under the circumstances, I did assent to the desire expressed; but that desire was in no way that the Province should abnegate its rights in regard to railway legislation. (Hear and cheers). And subsequently, when I found my name coupled with this statement, I took the opportunity of writing to the authorities at Ottawa, explicitly, my views with reference to the rights the Province might exercise with regard to railway legislation. (Hear, hear).”

He dealt with Hay’s speech lightly and well, explaining Manitoba’s unusual constitutional situation, which was different from that of every other province, and which permitted appeals of this sort only to the Parliament of Canada and not, as Hay proposed, to Britain. If Manitoba had a different constitutional status, and “been a party to the compact under which we entered Confederation, like them we would have the right of appeal; and that appeal would have been heard without any resort to the musket, as threatened by the member for St Clements (Loud laughter)…. It seems to be a favourite custom with men of small stature, to resort to warlike measures. (Renewed laughter and cheers). Still, notwithstanding the murderous proclivities – the fighting aspect – of the hon member for St. Clements (laughter) – it would seem best that this question shall be settled by amicable arrangement between the Province and the Dominion.” He strongly denied that there were any party aspects to the government’s plan and asked support on the basis of its “intrinsic merits, and on those alone. (Cheers).” It was an important statement of his government’s position.

**FP-LLM: Wed, 3 May 1882: Sifton** attacked the federal government’s control over Manitoba, and the removal of real powers from the provincial govt that accrued to all the other provinces. He condemned the “false and unconstitutional reasoning which seemed to give any portion of the Dominion the character of a colony, subject to the whims of the sister Provinces.” Disallowance of the SER was wrong. John A and Norquay had asserted the province possessed the right to issue railway charters. Norquay assisted in the passage of the SER charter. “What were we then? Not a Province, surely, but a colony. Not a colony of Great Britain, but a colony of the C.P.R. (Applause)”

Norquay interrupted Sifton when he came to the question of appeals to British authorities. He explained that Manitoba’s constitutional position differed from the other provinces because it had been created by Ottawa, whereas the others “received their constitutions from the Imperial authorities.” Thus, if the federal government breached the terms of the contract that had been created in 1867, appeal would lie to Britain in the others’ cases.

Sifton then resumed his argument, citing a “memorandum” prepared by Cartier, and “submitted to the Executive Council,” and then acquiring the status of an o-i-c, in which it is asserted that Manitoba and others created thereafter “should hold the same status as the four provinces now composing the Dominion and British Columbia when it comes in – and like them should hold its constitution subject only to alteration by the Imperial Legislature.” He then cited comparisons with economic growth in Minnesota – the beginning of an explicit North American economic context as the comparator for MB.

**Sutherland:** The election of 1879 had been a no-party election. But in the by-elections of 1881, “it seemed as though party politics had been forced on the country.”

And he noted that, during his visit to Ottawa, “he had heard the Premier of Manitoba complimented highly by several public men, for the zeal and ability with which he had pushed provincial affairs.”

Several speakers noted that $45,000 was a small sum to accept for the value of the public lands.

Brown delivered a long vigorous defence of the govt. [FP 8 May 1882, sitting of 4 May]

Greenway’s resolution was defeated 17-7. [Winram, Smith, Hay, Greenway, Sifton, Ross, McMillan

Norquay, Girard, Brown, LaRiviere, Walker – note arrival of AAC LaRiviere.

**FP-LLM** 15 May **1882**– sitting of Friday 12 May – a bill to secure the bldg of rlys in MB –

**Norquay:** in introducing the bill in 40-minute speech:

-- “this form of investment [appears to be] … a favourite one with capitalists at present.” The bldg of rlys “was undoubtedly going to be a great factor in the future prosperity of the province.” Need rules to guide. The CPR wld be focusing on the main line. Need branch lines. This bill sets out rules for incorporation, and minimum capitalization required, in order to ensure that sound and expeditious practices are followed, that “every facility and encouragement should be given those desiring to embark in public works.” [capital stock of $12000 per mile to be constructed; and 50% of the stock required shall have been subscribed and a sum of 10% of the amount subscribed must be deposited with provincial treasury as a guarantee of applicants’ good faith. This would weed out people – “imposters” -- who created companies merely in the hope of securing charters that would then be bought out. The MSW, for example, had to deposit $72,000 before it could proceed. A final clause stated that no line would be built within 6 miles of the international bdy, or 15 miles in the newly-added territory. This to avoid disallowance possibility. This recognized the policy and authority of feds’ Railway Bill of 1881.This policy had the support of the whole Dominion – “one calculated to foster a great national sentiment. (Cheers)”

**Greenway** – attacks – MB needs an outlet

The next sitting, Norquay withdrew the bill and said he would introduce another. He did so in the sitting of 16 May.

He then introduced the bill in 23 May **1882** sitting – it had been too stringent, people said, so the money provisions had been revised -- % of stock subscribed reduced to 10%. Municipalities and towns could remit taxes as a means of subsidy.

**FP-LLM sitting 15 May 1882:** Greenway attacks bill. Norquay defends: Feds and provinces had “coordinate powers in certain matters, and where the federal Parliament, acting clearly within its jurisdiction, imposes restrictions, of necessity the power of the greater must prevail over that of the less…. [JN doesn’t see Mowat approach to equal/separate] They were actuated by no other understanding than a desire to act within the constitutional powers given them as a Local Legislature.”

**FP-LLM sitting 15 May 1882: Lippset introduces act to incorporate the Loyal Orange Association of Manitoba.**

**FP sitting of 25 May 1882**: Norquay moves supply be granted with major speech on recent development of province – starting with drainage measures “reclaiming large portions of the public domain.” The benefits of redistribution were “undeniable.” Municipal system also valuable, especially because compulsory and therefore effective. Public exhibitions of MB produce also useful. He speaks of “that marvellous progress which now marked the growth of the country.”

In drainage, 444,155 cubic yards of earth had been moved, “completing a drainage of 188 miles in length.” – “draining off of surplus water.”

As for “serious divisions… of a national character…the Government were actuated by no sectional or national feeling…”

Manitoba had a right to the public lands – never lost sight of this “right.” He had been on 6 delegations to Ottawa – “had never returned empty-handed”. MB “had been unequally dealt with and had been at a great disadvantage…”

When that right to lands was conceded, “this province would be in a position, owing to her wealth, importance and representation at the capital, to make her voice heard effectually and could make the Government recoup her every cent received from the sale of her lands since entering Confederation (less expense of administering them) – Applause.”

Boundary – province had been enlarged.

Subsidy: the most recent delegation had won an increase from $100,000 to $227,000/year.

Party lines: “he could not close without an expression of regret that hon. Members opposite had directly introduced Dominion party politics into this House. He had all along been desirous to keep the bitterness of party strife outside the Legislature, so that the various measures should be decided solely on their own merits.” But the opposition had introduced a motion censuring the acts of the federal govt. “and the mischief was done.”

**Greenway replied** that the Govt had done the deed – member for North Dufferin in moving the Reply to Throne Speech -- by “a fulsome eulogy of the National Policy” – Dr. Wilson said “No.” Greenway replied “Yes.” And then goes on re disallowance.

And then subsidy -- Premier calls the deal ‘temporary’ – Tilley says 10 years -- not enough.

**FP-LLM sitting 15 May (evening) 1882: bdy extension:**  Norquay introduced resolution re bdy – w to 102 meridian, n to 60 parallel, e to Lake Superior and Prince Arthur’s Landing.

Lands and CPR – the rly would benefit all Canada, est. cost of $100 million, yet it “was to be built, solely and entirely, in the long run, out of resources obtained in Manitoba and the North-West.” The other provinces reaped the benefits but paid nothing. “Injustice” – but “the time was soon coming when by her power at Ottawa she would be enabled to secure that which was hers. The west will before long be so powerful that we must have a full settlement of account[sic] with the Eastern Provinces.”

Brown and Greenway spoke at length. The latter criticizes fact that this is to be a settlement for 10 years – “our pittance.”

Vote on Greenway’s amendment to resolution defeated 16-8

**FP-27 May 1882sitting on lowering Lake Manitoba.**

**FP-29 May 1882– sitting – Premier announced** that committee on private bills had rejected railway bills – no fewer than 20 according to Greenway.

Evening: premier presented budget

The province’s position is “a transitional one”. MB has not received “strict justice” because of lack of control of lands. The 4 million other Cdns have treated the protests of our 60-70,00 citizens “as to some extent insignificant.” There is a lack of equity in the operation of Confederation. In addition, MB paid dearly for the CPR.

Salaries estimates 29 May 1882 budget estimates – Cabinet ministers - $3000.

29 MLAs – $400.

**FP LLM – 5th Legislature, 17 May 1883 – First Session [prorogued 7 July 1883] [therefore 35 days] [38 in 2nd; 27 in 3rd; and 55 in 4th (1886)]**

LLM, FP 17 May1883 first session of 5th legislature

Opening in the new court house “with more than the usual éclat.” There was “a large turnout of the elite in the city to witness the inauguration. Flags were flying from a number of flagstaffs of the city, and the officers and members of the militia paraded in their uniforms, giving the streets a somewhat martial appearance.” The field battery fired the customary salute, a guard of honour presented arms.

Seating plan: Norquay flanked by La Riviere and Brown, and on opposite side Greenway, Killam and Conklin (both Wpg seats) faced them, and Joe Martin of Portage. Woodworth also on opposition front bench – 11 in total to face 15 [but a later division was 18-8] on govt side, including Leacock, Harrison, Wilson, Davidson, and only 2 other French – Goulet and Gigot.

Chamber “more commodious and better ventilated than that from which the Parliament retreated in time to prevent its falling about their ears.” -- “very comfortable cushioned seats” with desks – Aikins is Lt. Gov.

Throne Speech promised a resolution re “the general terms upon which the union of the provinces was effected and a clearer definition of the respective jurisdictions of the federal and provincial legislatures” than is afforded by the BNA act… The development of mineral resources in eastern portion of province requires bdy settlement with ON.

Development of new dept of Agriculture and Statistics – has encouraged widespread interest in Province’s agricultural interests.

Asylum for lunatics. Etc.

Delivered in English and French.

Many petitions: thistles and other noxious weeks, glanders and other animal diseases – preoccupation with agricultural production and efficiency.

Much mention in Throne Speech debate on recent progress in province, “rapid strides” etc.

Harrison – time to reconsider Confederation arrangements – much change and the new constitution of 1867 needed to be revised – MB’s unfair financial circumstance

Greenway – glad to see Harrison agrees with positions taken by opposition for some years – even the premier is now aware of the provincial Rights movement. He promises in Emerson to charter the Emerson and Northwestern Rly – if disallowed, to charter it again and again. But in Selkirk a month later he defended the federal govt’s policy on the CPR and the disallowance of the E&NWR. It is time for “free and full railway competition.”

21 June 1883: **Norquay: spoke for an hour, criticizing Greenway, and insisting there was no 10-year deal on subsidy:** rather, increases in provincial subsidy in 1873, 1876, 1879, 1882 -- and now the MB govt proposed a convention of provincial delegates to consider constitutional arrangements; it would increase knowledge of West in eastern Canada, make relations more friendly and based on clearer understanding of our position, and make constitutional powers of the two levels of govt clearer too – and to “render uniform the basis upon which subsidies are granted to the provinces.” The BNA Act is due for a “readjustment” [MFP, 21 June]

The province does not have the constitutional power to charter rlys to the boundary and there connect with an American line. He supported lines that opened up districts but not exceeding province’s power. Norquay won cheers and applause for many of the points in his speech.

No other member of the House in 1871 was still in the House. “(hear, and cheers).” This showed that “the public had confidence in him.” He was not a party leader but “he had as good, if not a better claim: he had principles, and he was not ashamed to stand by and uphold them…(Cheers).” And he sat down, after an hour, and having mocked Greenway again, “amid loud cheers.”

Killam and Wilson spoke effectively. And Brown. And Greenway.

Reply carried by a vote of 18 to 8.

Sitting of 31 May 1883: petition praying the incorporation of Loyal **Orange** Assocn

Premier introduced bill for establishment of a lunatic asylum, incl. purchase of a site, erection of bldgs, employees responsible for care – for cost of $40-50,000. There were 25 patients now. [FP 1 June 1883]

Portage Southern Rly – to Emerson – bill of incorporation, 2nd reading

**MFP 29 June 1883** – Norquay favoured the “old system of manly, honest, open system of voting,” Greenway and others did not. Temperature in the 90s, so debate was brief.

**MFP 29 June 1883** -  **Railway taxation** – Manitoba govt, said Norquay, could not tax the CPR in the newly-added areas of the province. Municipalities might try to tax it too heavily and this would not be fair to investors.

**MFP 29 June 1883 –** Keewatin Mining Co. passed all stages of incorporation.

**MFP 29 June 1883 – sitting** of 4 July – on supply – sat late into the night, and at 1:00 a.m. a member asked that they adjourn because they were all tired and could take up the work tomorrow, but Norquay urged them to continue – adjourned at 3:00 a.m.

**MFP 7 July 1883** – Norquay asked House about the CPR invitation to members to travel on rail line to end of track – when should they go?

“ - also a resolution asking that eastern bdy of province be defined. [6 July sitting]

**MFP 9 July 1883 – sitting of 7 July –** excavation desired by members to lower the level of Lake Manitoba

**1884 (Brandon Sun)**

**Brandon *Sun*** 14 January 1884 – it quotes Wpg *Sun* on Norquay’s likely entry into federal cabinet. JN leaves Wpg for Ottawa immediately. What portfolio? He will get Capt Scott’s seat when he becomes collector of inland revenue, or perhaps Royal’s if he becomes Lt Gov of one of the 3 provinces to be created – AB, SK, and Assiniboia. The new premier is a question – if Miller pans out in his present position, he wld be likely.

**Brandon *Sun*** 21 February 1884 – west MB badly needs redistribution

**Brandon *Sun*** 25 February 1884 – farmers’ convention called for 5 March

**Brandon *Sun*** 29 February 1884 – JN is back from Ottawa “without having accomplished anything.” He was “undermined and intrigued against by the Tory members from this province. Now that he has returned we learn from press dispatches that those members are seeking to obtain from the federal authorities the very concesions which formed the object of Mr. Norquay’s mission to the capital…. Repudiated by the party he is supposed to represent, and so far standing out against an alliance with the Farmers’ Union, he presents the unusual spectacle of a political chief without a following. True, he has probably a majority in the legislature, but in the changed conditions of the province those members do not at the present time represent anybody or anything…. We believe Mr. Norquay is thoroughly loyal to his native province, that he cares more for it than he does for any political party. He has been weak enough in the past, however, to permit himself to be used as the tool of a ring of politicians who care a greaat deal less for Manitoba than they do for the Conservative party…. [and] are now endeavoring to get rid of him.” Let him take the lead for Provincial Rights.

**Brandon *Sun*** 11 March 1884 – JN received the farmers, was not candid in defining his position, -- “Instead of doing this he talked in a circle for an hour or two without having said anything.” Let us see what he promises in the throne speech next month.

**Brandon *Sun*** 11 March 1884 – “The train from the east was in a snow drift fifteen miles west of Swift Current for fifty hours. Provisions were short… no breakfast…

**FP LLM – 5th Legislature, 13 March 1884 – Second Session [prorogued 3 June 1884] therefore sitting was 38 days in length**

**FP 14 March 1884** – opened by Aikins, even with “considerable éclat. The day was very auspicious for the opening ceremonies. The streets were thronged with people making their way to the House … There were a great number of strangers in the city, and flags were flying from most of the public buildings, giving the town a sort of holiday appearance.” Field battery fired the customary 13 guns. Guard of honour in full field dress with white gloves and swords and cross belts. Detachment of Mounted Police in scarlet uniforms. More than 100 ladies “comprising the elite and fashion of the city” occupied seats on the floor of the chamber. “New and gorgeous mace” carried by sgt-at-arms. Thos Spence, clerk of the house. Norquay as premier, LaRiviere as min of agriculture, Brown Public Works, Miller A-G (from Rat Portage seat). 5 French.

Throne Speech – “erection of a commodious Legislative Assembly Room and public offices suited to the requirements of this rapidly developing province.” Marquis of Lansdowne has succeeded Lorne – “apptmt of “so eminent a statesman is an evidence of the appreciation in which Her Majesty holds her British American possessions.”

Ontario bdy – reference will be submitted to JCPC to secure a decision on “the territory in dispute.”

Also have pressed for 60th parallel north and 102 meridian west – important especially for the “contemplated construction” of the HBR. [This item interested the *Minnedosa Tribune* 8 Feb 1884, which cited Norquay’s memorandum to the federal govt on the subject]

Regret re death at so early an age of Alexander McBeth Sutherland, Kildonan, Attorney General and briefly Prov Secretary. – “one of the brightest young men now serving the country in a representative capacity.” Greenway agreed – “one of his best personal friends … an honorable opponent.”

**FP, 18 March 1884** (sitting of 17 March): Norquay introduces notice of a resolution on public lands which asserts that Manitoba had demanded that public lands should be vested in legislature for the use of the province, and this remains the appropriate and best practice, and all provinces should possess “equal jurisdiction in all matters of a local nature” and whereas this “discriminating policy pursued towards Manitoba is calculated to undermine the feeling of common interest that this province should have in building up the Dominion,” and whereas MB will be forced to resort to direct taxation in the near future “to support its institutions and prosecute improvements necessary to the building up thereof” and which other provinces avoided by revenue from Crown lands, therefore be it resolved that assembly ask GG to cause an enquiry to be made into Manitoba’s relations with the Dominion and place it in “as favourable a position as regards her future necessities as are the four provinces confederated under the British North America Act.” And asking Sec of State for Colonies to amend the Manitoba Act to place it “on the same status in the Dominion as the older provinces of the Union.”

Norquay – notice of another resolution on “the financial relations of this Province with the Dominion and to cause such action to be taken as will insure to the province such revenue as will correspond to her growing necessities.” No more “humiliation of depending upon the intermittent increases from time to time made to her…”

C P Brown moves re HBR – committee to investigate “practicability of the establishment of a system of communication with this province via Hudson Bay.”

**FP, 19 March 1884** Throne Speech debate – C. S. Douglas (Emerson) “rapid strides” made by province – as in new bldg for legislature, etc.

Greenway made a “very full and ably argued speech.” Norquay defended easily. Amendment defeated 21-6 [Killam, Greenway, Winram, Hay, Young, Bell]

Norquay introduced his public lands resolution, emphasizing peoples’ demand in 1870 that public lands should belong to provincial govt. He also argued that the people of Manitoba shouldered their share of the national debt (in which they had no interest pre-1870), and much of the cost of construction of the CPR (though all parts of the country benefited by its holding the pieces of the country together).

**Brandon *Sun*** 20 March 1884 re HBR – JN spoke in Selkirk, and the Selkirk Herald has published a full report, HBR was first subject discussed -- JN: “to it more than to anything else is owing the great agitation that has taken place…[and will continue] till such time as that object is secured in the interest of this province.” This is not true, says Sun. It is not a cause of the unrest but “was suggested as a remedy for some of the grievanes under which they were suffering. It was not a grievance in itself.” The CPR contract ensured that Ottawa would disallow rail outlets to the south. We had to submit to that. This is why the HBR “has taken such a firm hold on the minds of the people.” This is nonsense – JN should know Manitoba has the right to build south – it is a provincial right. JN and Duncan McArthur think they could get advantages from this scheme and have tried to thwart private enterprise and Dominion chartered companies. That’s why McArthur sent Leacock to Ottawa with JN – “to advance their provincial scheme.” This is a “trick.” “The people of Manitoba want a railway to Hudson Bay and they will get it. But it will be as a private and commercial enterprise, built with private capital on the strength of a Dominion subsidy, and without the cost of a dollar to this province.”

**FP, 28 March 1884**: Norquay spoke in favour of a bill to incorporate the Emerson and Northwestern Railway. It would not go within 15 miles of the boundary and would not conflict with the CPR – he regretted that no action had been taken under other rly bills passed by MB assembly. They wanted branch rlys.

**FP, 29 March 1884**: Norquay led expressions of sympathy to Queen on death of her son, Prince Leopold, at age 31.

Drainage issues frequently arose.

**FP, 2 April 1884** Faced with a resolution on higher education, Norquay insisted on the priority of “common school education” “If there was one duty incumbent on the people of the province and legislature, it is to make provision for giving elementary education to the masses; and when the funds are scarcely sufficient to even subsidize to a small extent the expenses incurred by the people generally in this respect, it is almost folly to say that this House should provide means for a higher education. It is no doubt a very worthy object, and that should be to the fullest extent encouraged but there are, as had been already stated, institutions in the province to provide the means of higher education, …..”

**FP, 4 April 1884** Debate on organization of counties and municipalities – Norquay speech provoked cheers, and calls of “hear, hear,” and laughter on several occasions as he teased the opposition: “By their criticisms it would seem as if hon. members opposite conceived that they were Solons. (Laughter).” Mr. Hay noted Norquay’s amendment and resolution on reviewing the municipal system and also provoked much amusement when he observed that “as on former occasions,” the premier had adopted the opposition’s perspective and presented a “display of his craft. (cheers and laughter).” Norquay’s motion carried 18-8.

-Brandon *Sun* supported Greenway, Martin, & others who would abolish county councils and judicial district boards. JN amended their resolution by creating a select committee to inquire into the advisability of dispensing with the councils. Carried 18-8. [5 April 1884]

**FP, 4 April 1884** Resolution to build HBR, but ensure it be placed under the control of the province so that it wouldn’t be sold to highest bidder as the MSW was.

Brandon *Sun* criticized the resolution, called the reference to MSW a “peculiarly unhappy” reference, and noted that the “covert attack” on Sutherland was “cowardly” but excused Norquay – “in the bitterness of his disappointment he spoke right out.” [7 April 1884]. Leacock went to Ottawa a few months ago “ostensibly as Mr. Norquay’s private secretary and adviser, but really as the paid agent of Mr. Duncan McArthur to kill off the whole scheme unless he and his associates could get everything their own way.”

**FP, 17 April 1884** (sitting of 16 April) – Norquay budget speech: [two hours?] he started with the first such speech in Red River, delivered in 1835, which emphasized the need for greater government activity in order to ensure “the maintenance of good order and tranquility, and for the security and protection of lives and property.” His point was that, “long anterior to Confederation there was a community existing on the banks of the Red River, in which obtained the regular forms of Government such as they were – and we know that they were such as met the wants of the community admirably. Law and order were maintained. As British subjects, the settlers enjoyed their rights – they enjoyed, in measure, every right outside those guaranteed by elective and representative institutions. (hear, hear). And in pressing for those rights now as we have done, and as we intend to do (cheers) – we are pressing for that which was ours, in the olden time, and which will be ours yet again. (cheers).”

After 1870, the moneys available have been inadequate. First for highways along the river bank, “then the main outlets for travel” – then with immigration increases, highways and bridges radiating from Fort Garry in all directions. Thus frequent visits to Ottawa, “constant and reiterated complaints of the people.” We need more – we seek “the full measure of justice to which we are entitled.” If remedy does not take place, “then, as far as Manitoba is concerned, Confederation would before long become a thing of the past. (Hear, hear). It is impossible for Confederation to exist unless the provinces generally were placed in a more uniform position. (Cheers).” Comparing the union to a hotel, he didn’t think it was fair to feed “one of the sisters of Confederation” in the dining room and yet “another sister was confined to the kitchen, (laughter) and would not even get enough to eat there. (Renewed laughter).” Yes, we welcome immigration but we must have the means to deal with the newcomers and new districts. But the federal government gets the revenue from customs duties and land sales while we get the costs. “Such an arrangement is too one-sided. (Cheers)…. All we ask is fair play. (Cheers).””

Manitoba had assumed that the CPR, as a national institution, would be the only railway subsidized by the nation but “now a new theory prevails down East” and we will be asked to pay for the HBR as well. “Verily we are a highly-favoured community! (hear and laughter).” We now face “a resort to direct taxation – not a pleasant prospect by any means (hear, hear).” We need mine, mineral, timber and land sales revenues.

“Persons in the East” say that they gave Manitoba a $120 million railway, and forget that they put $90 million of their debt upon Canada when, as colonies, they entered Confederation. Manitoba had no debt when it entered.

He compared Manitoba to Minnesota’s deal within the US state system. Then PEI within Canada.

Another source: the pamphlet published as the full version of the speech: see UofAlberta, Peel website #1270:

“We must not forget, too, that on going into the Confederation partnership in 1870, our principal source of revenue was taken from us in the interest of the Dominion. We came into the compact, having possession of an asset that was better than any of the ‘assets’ so often quoted as belonging to the other provinces. ‘We entered the union free from debt.’ Pp 29-30

**Brandon *Sun* put** the speech on its front page, reported it thoroughly: “The province is in course of rapid development, and all undue economy would there be false economy, as tending to retard that development. (Hear, hear).” – JN’s pro-development thinking

His last few lines – peroration: “Public opinion has been gradually solidifying in relation to this matter. And now, so strong has the voice of public opinion become – so pressing are our necessities as a province -- that the government believe the time to be most opportune for urging again on the federal authorities the claims of the province” and we expect “complete success. (Cheers).” **Brandon *Sun*** 21 April 1884 The *Sun*’s editorial doubts success – “Norquay’s insincerities” are “too well known.”

Macbeth resigned as Clerk of Executive Council, replaced by Acton Burrows. [Ibid]

**FP, 19 April 1884** – Charles Stewart of Rounthwaite wrote Woodworth, MLA, who presented it to the house, “amid much laughter,” in which Stewart, a member of the Farmers’ Union, complained he had been arrested “on a charge of high treason” in Winnipeg where he had been attending the farmers’ convention. Attorney General Miller said he had never caused such an arrest and Stewart “had been made the victim of a practical joke by some of his friends.”

**FP, 23 April 1884** (22 April sitting) – delegation to Ottawa – a series of resolutions – passed through all stages unanimously.

**FP, 23 April 1884** – Greenway calls for redistribution of ridings – effective opposition leader. – he gave a strong speech on budget during the 23 April sitting – MFP 25 April.

**Brandon *Sun*** 25 April 1884: JN promises redistribution but his career is marred by “too many broken pledges”

**Brandon *Sun*** 8 May1884: JN will fail in Ottawa. He is “an imposter, who has been deceiving us long enough. Better a year of two of straight Tory government, under the Millers, the Wilsons and the Woodworths of the province; that, at least, would bring us to our senses, and a revolution would quickly follow.

**Brandon *Sun*** 15May1884: a report to the Rounthwaite Branch of the Farmers’ Union, Mr. Harley in chair. He reported on the convention and delegation to Norquay – he didn’t agree with the majority on the committee, who “were captured by the natural fluency of expression of the Premier, who was characterized more by verbosity of language than acumen.” Mr. Purves of the Union reported that 66 delegates had attended, passed the Bill of Rights, and now the Legislature had adopted it and sent an ultimatum to Ottawa. Freight rates had been reduced; the mile belt and so MB land had been opened – the Union had produced “material and lasting results” But “the great question at issue remained unsettled…”

Adjournment 29 April 1884: **Resumed sittings on 26 May 1884**

D. H Wilson, North Dufferin, introduced to House as Provincial Secretary.

Mission to Ottawa: -- report tabled in house on 27 May. Discussion delayed. On 29 May Greenway gave notice that he would move that the better terms be rejected because of the conditions attached which would involve the waiving of our just claims.

On 30 May (MFP 31 May 1884), Norquay tabled the government’s proposed answer to the federal Privy Council.

**MFP 3 June 1884** – Greenway --- now that we have set out a bill of rights, we had taken our stand. (cheers).” This was “a final demand”

**Norquay** – “As British subjects, we claim today rights in common with our sister provinces (cheers)…. One of the main elements of [Confederation’s] strength – that which must give it solidity and endurance – was equality of treatment to all the provinces…. There must be equal justice. ((Hear, hear).” Ottawa had advanced but not far enough, “and for that reason their proposition had not been accepted. (Cheers).”

Wagner of Woodlands disagreed and would vote against the motion.

Greenway – feds are “advancing the main line at the expense of the branch lines”

**MFP 4 June 1884;** last day of sitting – JN introduced bill at first and second readings “to provide for direct taxation in the province of Manitoba in order to raise a revenue for provincial purposes.” By giving the feds an ultimatum, they may find that revenue might have to be raised locally. This was to prepare people for the eventuality – “with a view of having it distributed throughout the province” -- of having no increase in the federal subsidy, in which case this measure might be required.

Prorogation followed. Lt Gov speech noted the “liberal” proposal from Ottawa which was, nonetheless, unacceptable because the terms “are such as would have rendered their acceptance by the Legislature an effectual bar to any future negotiations which the necessities of the province might warrant…”

**Brandon *Sun*** 12 June 1884 – refers to JN’s “weather-cock principles” for if it “is going to pay to sell himself and his country for a mess of pottage, he will be on hand at the appointed time to close the bargain. No other explanation of his reason for adopting the Farmers’ Union platform is needed.”

***Portage la Prairie Weekly Tribune-Review*** 24 December 1884: quotes Toronto Mail “One of the most notable events in connection with the convention was the presentation of the address from the representatives of Manitoba and the North-West. Hon. John Norquay also appeared as a speaker more than once showing himself to be the equal, as a powerful and eloquent debataer, of any man, bar none in the Dominion.”

**Fisheries**: calls for regulation and protection, 500 men fishing of L Manitoba alone. If this continues the fishery will become “comparatively worthless.”

**Brandon *Sun*** 15 January 1885 – JN at Ottawa “was more bent on having ‘a good time,’ than in attending to the business of his office…. His mission has ended in failure. But the worst feature of this miserable business… the degradation of Manitoba through her duly accredited ambassador… The miserable exhibition at Toronto is to be repeated at Montreal…. where he will again, doubtless, return thanks for all the evils resulting from the oppressive tyranny of the Ottawa Government.”

**Brandon *Sun*** 12 March1885: “Norquay must go: The Farmers’ Union: An influential and successful convention” – in Winnipeg – 300 delegates. Reports on a letter from Dr. Flemming, who could not attend bec. of issues in his home province – it attacks “corrupt and selfish partyism” and includes JN in his attack.

Another piece: “The people aroused” – Greenway meeting in Brandon, attacks JN for the trip east – “his visit to the banquets, his speeches, in which he said that Manitoba was perfectly satisfied with Ottawa administration, etc. and all of which he was repaid by the proffer of a position in the Cabinet; his mouth was shut when he got to Ottawa…” and he asked for too little, got less.

**Brandon *Sun*** 19 March1885 – JN is “no longer the leader of the people, but of a party; a party kept in power…by the votes of a fraction of the people, packed in the corner of the province.” What is more, JN “has allied himself for the favour and at the bidding of Sir John.”

Photo of legislature, *Winnipeg Times*, 19 March 1885 – emailed and in Norquay file there

***Times*** 19 March 1885 – Throne Speech -- completion of CPR north of L Superior “is an evidence of the energy with which work on the national highway is being prosecuted, and of the determination of the Central Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to connect by an all rail route the fertile prairies of our province with the seaboard, and thereby secure expeditious transport of the products of our country to the markets of Europe.” Also – now telegraph east-west “on Canadian soil… helps to strengthen the bond of union between Manitoba, the central province of Canada, and her eastern sisters in Confederation.” [link to oil pipelines in 2010-2020]

Charles E. Hamilton elected, new attorney general. [replaced Killam in South Wpg]

Spence resigned as clerk, C. A. Sadleir replaced him. ***Times*** 24 March 1885 says he is younger than his predecessor, speaks more clearly, and is very attractive, “and many admiring glances are cast in that direction from the ladies’ gallery.”

***MFP*** editorial, Friday 20 March – sceptical reception of throne speech – not very impressed. ***Times*** 20 March 1885 mocks the “fit’ of the MFP, defends the speech, and says that by the close of the session, “Mr. Norquay will add to the esteem and confidence in which he is held by a large majority of the people of the province.”

***The Sun*** 20 March 1885 noted an order “abolishing the bar in the basement of the building which was so liberally patronized during last session… The members are anxious that Hon. John should rise and explain. The Speaker’s private cupboard is said to stand a terrible siege at times. The proceedings of the House are likely to be drier than ever now.”

***MFP*** editorial, Saturday 21 March – laments absence of promises re redistribution and ballot – “Mr. Norquay, it is now evident, will do nothing for us.…He must, therefore, be pushed aside.” 23 March – refers to “Mr. Norquay’s surrender” and argues, in reference to a forthcoming farmers’ convention, notes “the hostility of the country to Mr. Norquay’s ‘Better Terms.’”

***Times*** 23 March 1885 Spectator “Gallery Gossip” – Norquay ‘holds the proudest and most honourable position in his native country today. He has not lost his senses…” and he will not become minister of the interior in Ottawa – he has a “far prouder position”

Norquay obtained from federal govt $100,000 in lieu of public lands.

***Times*** editorial 24 March 1885 noted Norquay’s reply “was a masterly effort and completely refuted” opposition arguments.

***Times:*** The verbatim account of speeches [24 March 1885]:

**Greenway: Yes** the transcontinental was built quickly. But: “It would have been better for this province and the C.P.R. itself to have built more slowly and left funds for branch lines.” He hoped province would “lend tangible aid” to the HBR project.

**Norquay:** The British Association members visiting here last autumn saw the country in unfavourable circumstances – rainy season – but “they were immensely satisfied. They were gratified to know that there was on this side of the Atlantic such a magnificent country which bore allegiance to the British crown and they predicted for us a great future.”

CPR – is not a Manitoba rly but a national one – “and what would Canada be today but for that policy? (Cheers). We hear rumours of serious trouble in the west, and he heard they were well-founded. How would the people of Canada have sent troops to speedily crush this rising but for this railway?” [Riel]

Delegates negotiated for MB in Ottawa “and had not yielded one iota until they were satisfied that all that was fair and was granted to the other provinces would be granted to Manitoba. (Cheers).” It was a great result to the negotiations – the province’s position was equal to the other provinces, and “even a better position.”

He was not upset by the bdy decision and very glad of a conclusion because “harmony” would prevail in relations with neighbour.

He then denounced the opposition for its agitation and won cheers after each sentence.

Turning to rlys, he noted the throne speech promised aid to railways. The provincial govt could not afford to do so before but now “Manitoba could be able to grant such aid as would give an impetus to railway construction, and he felt that any scheme of that character would be endorsed by the House. (Cheers).” He referred to the south and west, and to the HB plans.

When he ended, his speech received “loud and continued cheers.”

The Sun’s editorial on 24 March 1885 commented on Norquay’s promises re redistribution and ballot and timing of session (it did not take acount of farmers’ ease of attendance) – “In all these matters promises have been made by the Premier, but at the event proves, they have been broken with an assurance and nonchalance characteristic of Mr. Norquay.”

**MFP 26 March 1885**: on better terms deal – shows language concerning Norquay and his govt becoming much more extreme: “As Mr. Norquay now stands self-confessed as the betrayer of the cause of the Province and a deceiver of the public, the people of the Province will surely know how to deal with him. Are they ready to keep their necks beneath his feet, and to be made fools of at his whim and caprice?”

***The Times*** sees it as “a lengthy and eloquent speech 27 March 1885 – JN spoke for about two hours, so did Greenway. On 28 March, *The Times* called JN’s speech “elaborate and masterful.” And the Norquay and Murray visit to Ottawa “should be marked as a red letter event in the history of Manitoba… the beginning of a new era in the substantial development of the province.”

The *MFP* said he spoke for 1½ hours “with his usual force and effectiveness of oratory. The galleries contained a considerable number of visitors who listened with evident interest and appreciation of the hon. gentleman’s speaking powers.” [MFP, 27 March 1885] He said the people of Manitoba “had been overridden by opinions of the eastern section of Canada; and he said so feelingly as one born in this province. The question of striving for equality had occupied the attention of public men here during the last fifteen years, in which time a process of settlement and development had taken place which had made Manitoba known and placed her claims foremost in the consideration of the statesmen of the day.” He believed that he should be given the credit for bringing the case forward. The previous increases came as if acts of charity – not rectifying inequalities. He condemned the Farmers Union -- “so subversive of free institutions.” They should leave the country.

*The Times* 28 March 1885: The Govt won the vote 17-9 [Greenway, Conklin,Winram, Hay, Gigot, Young, Jackson, Martin, Bell] [Wagner, Mawhinney, and Crawford absent but Govt supporters, Cyr wld have opposed, Gigot switched sides] fullhouse vote would have been 21-9. Though Cyr claim would make it 20-10.

It also claimed that the popular vote for Govt in last elections was 5600-5100, despite Opposition claims that they were in majority in votes. Govt might also be given additional votes from acclamations, to make total 5860. The FP claimed the 8 opposition members represent the opinion of 9/10ths of the people of the province. *MFP* 28 March 1885.

The *MFP* 28 March 1885 mocked JN’s speech – he brought us to eastern attention alright – there is a new season in Ottawa now, to go with house-cleaning season and ice cream season there is now “the Norquay expedition season … Mr. Norquay is known to our Eastern friends as the blooming beggar from the blizzard’s birthplace.”

*MFP* 28 March 1885 Greenway’s speech [I use the next sentences in 1884 section of chapter]: referred to 1884 caucus of all legislature members, laying “party differences aside,” re response to original Ottawa offer – “agreed upon Manitoba’s ultimatum to the federal authorities… it was thoroughly understood that the Bill of Rights contained Manitoba’s final demands.” – legislators “summarily rejected” the federal offer – “Secession was threatened.” In conclusion, Greenway spoke of rights and just demands, said JN had obtained only $20,000 more, and urged members to “rise in their might and strike out the finality [“finalty” sic] clause.”

The *Free Press* arrived by messenger during the sitting, “its appearance was greeted with loud applause from both sides of the House. The proceedings were stopped and the news of the disturbances in the North-West was eagerly perused.” 30 March 1885 FP.

The House sat until well after 5:00 a.m., ‘the longest that has even been held by the Manitoba Legislature.” Members sang “God Save the Queen” “and then went home for breakfast.” 30 March 1885 FP.

MFP 30 March 1885 – Race and racism:

Mr Hay in finality – better terms debate: [26 March sitting]: He had been here before 1870. He listened to premier say “that in these early days the ‘Breeds’ – as the hon. gentleman called them – were looked down upon and despised by the white settlers. He could not agree with the hon. Premier on that point for then as now the whites entertained the greatest respect for the half-breed population of this country, and as evidence” he cited Norquay’s nomination by acclamation by “a meeting composed almost wholly of whites.” JN was, he said, “always willing to change his opinions when he thought that it was in his own interests to do so (hear, hear).” Hay was an independent. “Partyism” was a curse to any new country.” Needed to unite in interests of our community. But JN went to Ottawa via detour to party convention honouring John A. in Toronto – there JN was much praised and petted, told he would rise to federal cabinet. And he gave up his defence of Manitoba’s interests as a consequence.

FP editorial on finality deal was fierce – JN’s “a traitor, a hired betrayer” -- will now accept federal cabinet office as Minister of Interior. Local legislature is example of “unreasoning, cringing, despicable servility and venality.” In editorial “The Accepted ‘Better Terms’” [nd, probably 30 March 1885]

MFP 31 March 1885 – C. S. Douglas said he approved the subsidy in lieu of provincial control of public lands because fed grant of “$100,000 annually in perpetuity” was more than province could hope to attain otherwise.

*The Times* 31 March said the principal claim that Manitoba has always urged is that Manitoba had not the same privileges accorded to her as the other provinces had when they entered the Union.

*The Sun* invites Norquay to resign. 31 March 1885.

*The Commercial* ca. 10 April 1885 “The Better Terms?” also condemns Norquay “being famed for the pliability of his own backbone”

*The Times* 11 April 1885– JN gave notice in house that he would move provincial aid to HBR

*The Times* 14 April 1885 – house passes resolution unanimously (JN agree) that troubles in NW were far distant and did not affect MB and shd not deter immigrants who can come “in the most perfect security.”

*The Times* 15 April 1885 – re sitting of 14th – JN said John McCormack had been released from jail, on authority of Governor-General. He explained that the 90th battalion had been called out to ensure public order – “there was danger of a riot occurring” – 500-600 people came to the gaol and the govt was told this gathering might occur again on the next night “and at the request of the Government to certain magistrates an order was issued calling out the militia for the protection of public property.”

Free Press 1 April 1886- records Martin’s notice of a motion re this flogging which said “the crime had been a trivial one” and a first offence and did not warrant this penalty. And Miller did resign but then got “a lucrative” appointment: “such flogging was an outrage” and members of the govt should be “condemned for their participation in said punishment” [168]

MFP 7 April – “John F. Cormack” – incident occurred on 30 October 1884. Martin read account from *Daily Times* of that date – “cries for mercy…lacerated back... fainting.” “The incident caused tremendous excitement in this city, and a large mob advanced upon the legislative building with the view of treating to condign punishment the Attorney General….” Miller resigned, “and it was rumoured (he thought the author of the statement was the hon. gentleman himself) that the resignation was obtained by the Premier, so that he might produce it, if necessary, to allay public sentiment; and it was rumoured that the Premier, having once got the resignation of the hon. gentleman (who, it was rumoured, was a strong competitor for the Premier’s position) put the resignation into active force without the consent of the Attorney General.” Miller then went to Ottawa to present his case to the GG, condemned the govt here, then was promised the position he now holds. But Miller was “not alone responsible for the punishment, as it had been inflicted by the authority of an order-in-council, for which all members of the Government were alike responsible.” [175] Defeated in party vote, 15-7.

***The Manitoba Sun*** added on 7 April that Cormack’s flogging was for attempting to escape from the provincial jail. It noted that the story in *The Times* was written by James Poole, a young reporter who almost lost his job as a result: “it was a rare chance for a sensation, and the temptation was too strong for the enterprising youth who forgot for the time that he was on a Government organ (?) and ‘spread himself’ drawing a soul-harrowing picture of McCormick’s agony.” The paper took it all back but the AG was “forced to step out of the cabinet in consequence.” Ned Farrer of the Toronto *Mail*, who had never liked Miller, said he first met him at a prize fight in Ontario, said the act was one of “wanton cruelty, and went on to remark that if the culprit had been guilty of swindling small capitalists, starting a bogus gold mine, or establishing a cattle ranch on paper, and thus roping in gullible individuals, or guilty of all the acts named, he would have been elected to the legislative assembly. The reading of this extract caused lots of fun in the House, the members enjoying the joke immensely.” He “struck pretty hard” at the Provincial Secretary for being present at the flogging and thereby sanctioning it.

“Mr. Martin is a very good speaker – in fact, it is claimed by many that he is the best in the House, even excelling the Premier. The difference between the two seems to be that Mr. Martin works up his cases better than Mr. Norquay, who rarely, except in very important cases, takes the time to prepare his speech. He relies largely on the inspiration of the moment, and in most cases avails himself of chance arguments that crop up.” Martin is “very painstaking, an indefatigable worker, and possesses a wonderfully retentive memory. He never uses a note but simply talks away with perfect fluency… Mr Martin does not appear to be a very popular member of the House, although he has his friends. Mr. Norquay does not seem to like him, and in fact most members on the government side declare an aversion for him. But there is little love lost between them. Mr. Martin doesn’t seem to care….” When Martin sat down, all eyes turned to Dr. Wilson but he refused to be drawn. He “looked a trifle pale, but stolid. A nod to the Speaker was given and the members were called in to divide on the question. The motion was lost on a straight party vote. Thus ended what was expected to be an interesting and exciting debate in the House.” [178]

***The Manitoba Sun*** will be independent and “absolutely impartial” 6 April 1886 [176a]

*The Times* 15 April 1885 – **HBR** – JN stated: “another outlet by which the surplus produce of our famers may be exported and reach the market where the highest prices can be secured…”

Manitobans “still believe that the old route by which access was made to Manitoba is so important that it will become the avenue and great artery …”

JN – Manitoba needs “another avenue to the seaboard” – we propose to let investors know of our support by promising a million-dollar debenture grant upon rly’s completion.

And, to aid branch lines, an offer of an advance of $1/acre of lands granted in aid of rlys by federal govt on condition that the rly convey to province the said lands as payment therefore.

*The Times* 17 April 1885 – JN budget speech – JN criticizes opposition for its use of his 1884 words to condemn him in ’85.

*The Sun* reported that Norquay went to Portage with Col. Smith’s battalion Wed. evening and returned yesterday evening. [nd, but probably 17 April edition]

MFP 18 April 1885 – JN said “if there was one thing of vital importance to the people of this province it was the question of railway extension.” Settlement had spread everywhere because lands were “equally favourable throughout the whole extent” of the province’s west and farms had increased in number with “unprecedented rapidity.” He explained that “the assistance advanced would only be a claim against the land grant the railway company received from the Federal Government.” [therefore province was secured financially]

Woodworth noted that only the M&NW would qualify – up to $7500 per mile.[said Dr. Wilson]

Greenway in reply praised Norquay’s speech of 1884 and damned the settlement of 1885. MFP 23 and 24 April 1885.

MFP and Times of 24 April argue about references in an earlier Times article to Joe Martin’s allegedly disgraceful behaviour in the House – “drunken drivellings”

Discussion in 1885 of the Selkirk asylum site – had to be drained twice? Site chosen was not appropriate? MFP 25 April 1885 Report of public accounts committee, in MFP 2 May 1885, notes spending of $44,700 in 1884 and estimate of $52,500 to finish – tho/ only $50,000 had been allocated for total cost.

*The Times* 29 April 1885 – Greenway moved use of ballot in elections – JN says the constituency that tried it some years ago prefers “the only manly, open, and honest way of declaring their convictions.” In the 30 April issue, JN revised his position – let each person choose his method of voting. A “dual system” – though he thought it was not “conducive to manly feeling.”

On redistribution, called for by Greenway and Liberals – JN agreed that it was due but didn’t plan to introduce legislation at this session. [28-30 April, Times and FP]

Coal: Public accounts committee report, MFP 2 May 1885, re receipt dated 4 March 1884 signed by acting mgr of Merchants’ Bank to MB Govt for $2000 on account of note to SK Coal Co. that “appears to have been given on payment of that amount. No coal seems to have been required, or asked for, or delivered, until the 3rd October following. The first account rendered for the same is dated 8th Nov 1884, and the last coal requisitioned for being on the 7th April 1885, and the account for the same being rendered on the 15th April 1885, more than a year after the account had been paid. Without discussing the object in view in advancing that amount to the Saskatchewan Coal Company, your committee is of opinion that such advances should not be made without the authority and sanction of the Legislature.” The Committee also noted a payment to Premier of $1000 for expenses associated with delegations to Ottawa, 1878-1882 inclusive. The delegation to Ottawa in 1884 seems to have incurred expenses of $3628.25 – “Your committee hope that in the future a recurrence of so large an expenditure will be avoided.” The report was adopted.

**MFP editorial 4 May 1885** – says the “minority report” on the public accounts committee censured the Govt but the Govt members decided to accept its censure and pass it anyway. FP laughed at the govt which was now “held in popular detestation and contempt…” – how could its members vote for the opposition’s amended motion full of criticisms of the Public Accounts report? “The history and contents of that document entitle it to rank chief among the Legislative curiosities of the age. It is the only thing of the kind in the world.”

**MFP 4 May 1885: very partisan** account of the debate: Greenway moved a want of confidence motion. Norquay insisted this was out of order and, according to MFP, the opposition laughed at him: “Hon. Mr. Norquay kicked strenuously against having the motion put, but seeing no hope of escaping in that direction (after examining several large volumes on Parliamentary practice which he had brought down from the library) he proceeded to hurl a storm of invective and imprecations against the Opposition, directing his vindictive thrusts mainly against Mr. Conklin, who had been active in unearthing the scandals referred to in the report. The Premier’s senseless denunciations were met with roars of laughter from the Opposition which worked him into a state of passion that must have been painful to his supporters.”

After more denunciation from Conklin, Norquay spoke again, “in a sarcastic strain, using a bitterness of language which indicated that his anger was thoroughly aroused. He said he could scarcely characterize by words strong enough the attempt to spring such a motion upon the House at the last moment …for the purpose of creating an impression throughout the country that was entirely false. The movers would find themselves mistaken in their little game which could only emanate from little minds. He felt that when he had had the confidence of the country for fourteen years, the miserable insinuations contained in the resolution would be futile. He had been known in the country longer than his opponents had been in it, and where he was best known he was most trusted.” As for the Sask Coal Co, “had he not been connected with that company he would have advised a gift of $5000 or $6000 because of what that company had done to reduce the price of coal.” He addressed a range of issues, until the opposition began to ask if he had views on the war in Egypt or the price of wheat. The motion was not put to the vote because the Lieutenant Governor had arrived, a half-hour ahead of the time announced for the prorogation, and he proceeded to give assent to bills and thereby to end the debate in the House. He then withdrew “and the members shortly after dispersed without the usual demonstrations of good feeling on the part of the Government.” This was the sitting of Saturday 2 May.

***The Times account*** of the debate is in its 4 May edition too: “Greenway’s Game: An Attempt to Outvote the Government during the Absence of Several Members: A Dirty Political Trick in which the Grit Leader was Foiled”. Greenway insisted he could bring a motion of non-confidence at any time. Norquay said he had to give “due notice” describing the motion as “the most ungentlemanly, unworthy and unprecedented attack upon a government” that had the confidence of the House. It had revealed all the accounts, members on both sides had found mistakes and errors, there had been no attempt at concealment “as there was nothing wrong.” Conklin feared that, without such scrutiny, the Govt “would have been allowed to continue to squander the people’s money.” Norquay was shocked that the opposition was using such claims to take advantage of the Govt.

Norquay then “addressed the House in an able and eloquent speech.” Greenway had been searching for issues “upon which he thought he could assail the Government.” Now they try this expedient “when members of this House have largely gone home. He did not believe such a procedure could be found in the annals of any legislature in the universe – of a motion of such importance ever sprung upon a Government enjoying the confidence of the country.” The issues mentioned had been expenditures for the public good. Rather than “a fair and impartial investigation” of the accounts, opposition members had been using the committee “to carry on the war of prejudice against the Government.”

***The Times editorial*** 4 May 1885: “a mean, contemptible trick” – the motion should have been ruled out of order, but the Speaker did not do so. “In a thin House he attempted to rush through a want of confidence motion and discredit the Government to a certain extent in the eyes of the country. But he miserably failed…” seven Govt supporters were absent, only one of Opposition. “It was a contemptible piece of political trickery all through.”

Greenway, a year later, noted in House that he had regretted having to introduce a motion of non-confidence but “the Premier stood up and talked until His Honour came down and prorogued the House.” MFP 9 March 1886. *The Daily Manitoban* put it that Greenway’s speech said: “the Premier had talked away on all manner of subjects until His Honour came and prorogued the House.” [*Daily Manitoban*, 9 March 1886]

**MFP 4 May 1885** Death of Col Kennedy – smallpox, in London – part of first Red River expedition. Registrar of County of Selkirk, then of Winnipeg, mayor 1875-76, organized voyageurs contingent to Egypt – a “universally beloved” man, a retiring man who was sought for positions

Legislature: random notes in my files for Hansard 1884-85:

**FP, 17 April 1884** (sitting of 16 April) – Norquay budget speech: [two hours?] he started with the first such speech in Red River, delivered in 1835, which emphasized the need for greater government activity in order to ensure “the maintenance of good order and tranquility, and for the security and protection of lives and property.” His point was that, “long anterior to Confederation there was a community existing on the banks of the Red River, in which obtained the regular forms of Government such as they were – and we know that they were such as met the wants of the community admirably. Law and order were maintained. As British subjects, the settlers enjoyed their rights – they enjoyed, in measure, every right outside those guaranteed by elective and representative institutions. (hear, hear). And in pressing for those rights now as we have done, and as we intend to do (cheers) – we are pressing for that which was ours, in the olden time, and which will be ours yet again. (cheers).”

After 1870, the moneys available have been inadequate. First for highways along the river bank, “then the main outlets for travel” – then with immigration increases, highways and bridges radiating from Fort Garry in all directions. Thus frequent visits to Ottawa, “constant and reiterated complaints of the people.” We need more – we seek “the full measure of justice to which we are entitled.” If remedy does not take place, “then, as far as Manitoba is concerned, Confederation would before long become a thing of the past. (Hear, hear). It is impossible for Confederation to exist unless the provinces generally were placed in a more uniform position. (Cheers).” Comparing the union to a hotel, he didn’t think it was fair to feed “one of the sisters of Confederation” in the dining room and yet “another sister was confined to the kitchen, (laughter) and would not even get enough to eat there. (Renewed laughter).” Yes, we welcome immigration but we must have the means to deal with the newcomers and new districts. But the federal government gets the revenue from customs duties and land sales while we get the costs. “Such an arrangement is too one-sided. (Cheers)…. All we ask is fair play. (Cheers).””

Manitoba had assumed that the CPR, as a national institution, would be the only railway subsidized by the nation but “now a new theory prevails down East” and we will be asked to pay for the HBR as well. “Verily we are a highly-favoured community! (hear and laughter).” We now face “a resort to direct taxation – not a pleasant prospect by any means (hear, hear).” We need mine, mineral, timber and land sales revenues.

“Persons in the East” say that they gave Manitoba a $120 million railway, and forget that they put $90 million of their debt upon Canada when, as colonies, they entered Confederation. Manitoba had no debt when it entered.

He compared Manitoba to Minnesota’s deal within the US state system. Then PEI within Canada.

Adjournment 29 April 1884: **Resumed sittings on 26 May 1884**

D. H Wilson, North Dufferin, introduced to House as Provincial Secretary.

Mission to Ottawa: -- report tabled in house on 27 May. Discussion delayed. On 29 May Greenway gave notice that he would move that the better terms be rejected because of the conditions attached which would involve the waiving of our just claims.

On 30 May (MFP 31 May 1884), Norquay tabled the government’s proposed answer to the federal Privy Council.

**MFP 3 June 1884** – Greenway --- now that we have set out a bill of rights, we had taken our stand. (cheers).” This was “a final demand”

**Norquay** – “As British subjects, we claim today rights in common with our sister provinces (cheers)…. One of the main elements of [Confederation’s] strength – that which must give it solidity and endurance – was equality of treatment to all the provinces…. There must be equal justice. ((Hear, hear).” Ottawa had advanced but not far enough, “and for that reason their proposition had not been accepted. (Cheers).”

Wagner of Woodlands disagreed and would vote against the motion.

Greenway – feds are “advancing the main line at the expense of the branch lines”

**MFP 4 June 1884;** last day of sitting – JN introduced bill at first and second readings “to provide for direct taxation in the province of Manitoba in order to raise a revenue for provincial purposes.” By giving the feds an ultimatum, they may find that revenue might have to be raised locally. This was to prepare people for the eventuality – “with a view of having it distributed throughout the province” -- of having no increase in the federal subsidy, in which case this measure might be required.

Prorogation followed. Lt Gov speech noted the “liberal” proposal from Ottawa which was, nonetheless, unacceptable because the terms “are such as would have rendered their acceptance by the Legislature an effectual bar to any future negotiations which the necessities of the province might warrant…”

**Hansard 1885**

Photo of legislature, *Winnipeg Times*, 19 March 1885 – emailed and in Norquay file there

***Times*** 19 March 1885 – Throne Speech -- completion of CPR north of L Superior “is an evidence of the energy with which work on the national highway is being prosecuted, and of the determination of the Central Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to connect by an all rail route the fertile prairies of our province with the seaboard, and thereby secure expeditious transport of the products of our country to the markets of Europe.” Also – now telegraph east-west “on Canadian soil… helps to strengthen the bond of union between Manitoba, the central province of Canada, and her eastern sisters in Confederation.” [link to oil pipelines in 2010-2020]

Charles E. Hamilton elected, new attorney general. [replaced Killam in South Wpg]

Spence resigned as clerk, C. A. Sadleir replaced him. ***Times*** 24 March 1885 says he is younger than his predecessor, speaks more clearly, and is very attractive, “and many admiring glances are cast in that direction from the ladies’ gallery.”

***MFP*** editorial, Friday 20 March – sceptical reception of throne speech – not very impressed. ***Times*** 20 March 1885 mocks the “fit’ of the MFP, defends the speech, and says that by the close of the session, “Mr. Norquay will add to the esteem and confidence in which he is held by a large majority of the people of the province.”

***The Sun*** 20 March 1885 noted an order “abolishing the bar in the basement of the building which was so liberally patronized during last session… The members are anxious that Hon. John should rise and explain. The Speaker’s private cupboard is said to stand a terrible siege at times. The proceedings of the House are likely to be drier than ever now.”

***MFP*** editorial, Saturday 21 March – laments absence of promises re redistribution and ballot – “Mr. Norquay, it is now evident, will do nothing for us.…He must, therefore, be pushed aside.” 23 March – refers to “Mr. Norquay’s surrender” and argues, in reference to a forthcoming farmers’ convention, notes “the hostility of the country to Mr. Norquay’s ‘Better Terms.’”

***Times*** 23 March 1885 Spectator “Gallery Gossip” – Norquay ‘holds the proudest and most honourable position in his native country today. He has not lost his senses…” and he will not become minister of the interior in Ottawa – he has a “far prouder position”

Norquay obtained from federal govt $100,000 in lieu of public lands.

***Times*** editorial 24 March 1885 noted Norquay’s reply “was a masterly effort and completely refuted” opposition arguments.

***Times:*** The verbatim account of speeches [24 March 1885]:

**Greenway: Yes** the transcontinental was built quickly. But: “It would have been better for this province and the C.P.R. itself to have built more slowly and left funds for branch lines.” He hoped province would “lend tangible aid” to the HBR project.

**Norquay:** The British Association members visiting here last autumn saw the country in unfavourable circumstances – rainy season – but “they were immensely satisfied. They were gratified to know that there was on this side of the Atlantic such a magnificent country which bore allegiance to the British crown and they predicted for us a great future.”

CPR – is not a Manitoba rly but a national one – “and what would Canada be today but for that policy? (Cheers). We hear rumours of serious trouble in the west, and he heard they were well-founded. How would the people of Canada have sent troops to speedily crush this rising but for this railway?” [Riel]

Delegates negotiated for MB in Ottawa “and had not yielded one iota until they were satisfied that all that was fair and was granted to the other provinces would be granted to Manitoba. (Cheers).” It was a great result to the negotiations – the province’s position was equal to the other provinces, and “even a better position.”

He was not upset by the bdy decision and very glad of a conclusion because “harmony” would prevail in relations with neighbour.

He then denounced the opposition for its agitation and won cheers after each sentence.

Turning to rlys, he noted the throne speech promised aid to railways. The provincial govt could not afford to do so before but now “Manitoba could be able to grant such aid as would give an impetus to railway construction, and he felt that any scheme of that character would be endorsed by the House. (Cheers).” He referred to the south and west, and to the HB plans.

When he ended, his speech received “loud and continued cheers.”

The Sun’s editorial on 24 March 1885 commented on Norquay’s promises re redistribution and ballot and timing of session (it did not take account of farmers’ ease of attendance) – “In all these matters promises have been made by the Premier, but at the event proves, they have been broken with an assurance and nonchalance characteristic of Mr. Norquay.”

**MFP 26 March 1885**: on better terms deal – shows language concerning Norquay and his govt becoming much more extreme: “As Mr. Norquay now stands self-confessed as the betrayer of the cause of the Province and a deceiver of the public, the people of the Province will surely know how to deal with him. Are they ready to keep their necks beneath his feet, and to be made fools of at his whim and caprice?”

***The Times*** sees it as “a lengthy and eloquent speech 27 March 1885 – JN spoke for about two hours, so did Greenway. On 28 March, *The Times* called JN’s speech “elaborate and masterful.” And the Norquay and Murray visit to Ottawa “should be marked as a red letter event in the history of Manitoba… the beginning of a new era in the substantial development of the province.”

The *MFP* said he spoke for 1½ hours “with his usual force and effectiveness of oratory. The galleries contained a considerable number of visitors who listened with evident interest and appreciation of the hon. gentleman’s speaking powers.” [MFP, 27 March 1885] He said the people of Manitoba “had been overridden by opinions of the eastern section of Canada; and he said so feelingly as one born in this province. The question of striving for equality had occupied the attention of public men here during the last fifteen years, in which time a process of settlement and development had taken place which had made Manitoba known and placed her claims foremost in the consideration of the statesmen of the day.” He believed that he should be given the credit for bringing the case forward. The previous increases came as if acts of charity – not rectifying inequalities. He condemned the Farmers Union -- “so subversive of free institutions.” They should leave the country.

*The Times* 28 March 1885: The Govt won the vote 17-9 [Greenway, Conklin,Winram, Hay, Gigot, Young, Jackson, Martin, Bell] [Wagner, Mawhinney, and Crawford absent but Govt supporters, Cyr wld have opposed, Gigot switched sides] full-house vote would have been 21-9. Though Cyr claim would make it 20-10.

It also claimed that the popular vote for Govt in last elections was 5600-5100, despite Opposition claims that they were in majority in votes. Govt might also be given additional votes from acclamations, to make total 5860. The FP claimed the 8 opposition members represent the opinion of 9/10ths of the people of the province. *MFP* 28 March 1885.

The *MFP* 28 March 1885 mocked JN’s speech – he brought us to eastern attention alright – there is a new season in Ottawa now, to go with house-cleaning season and ice cream season there is now “the Norquay expedition season … Mr. Norquay is known to our Eastern friends as the blooming beggar from the blizzard’s birthplace.”

*MFP* 28 March 1885 Greenway’s speech referred to 1884 caucus of all legislature members, laying “party differences aside,” re response to original Ottawa offer – “agreed upon Manitoba’s ultimatum to the federal authorities… it was thoroughly understood that the Bill of Rights contained Manitoba’s final demands.” – legislators “summarily rejected” the federal offer – “Secession was threatened.” In conclusion, Greenway spoke of rights and just demands, said JN had obtained only $20,000 more, and urged members to “rise in their might and strike out the finality [“finalty” sic] clause.”

The *Free Press* arrived by messenger during the sitting, “its appearance was greeted with loud applause from both sides of the House. The proceedings were stopped and the news of the disturbances in the North-West was eagerly perused.” 30 March 1885 FP.

The House sat until well after 5:00 a.m., ‘the longest that has even been held by the Manitoba Legislature.” Members sang “God Save the Queen” “and then went home for breakfast.” 30 March 1885 FP.

MFP 30 March 1885 – Race and racism:

Mr Hay in finality – better terms debate: [26 March sitting]: He had been here before 1870. He listened to premier say “that in these early days the ‘Breeds’ – as the hon. gentleman called them – were looked down upon and despised by the white settlers. He could not agree with the hon. Premier on that point for then as now the whites entertained the greatest respect for the half-breed population of this country, and as evidence” he cited Norquay’s nomination by acclamation by “a meeting composed almost wholly of whites.” JN was, he said, “always willing to change his opinions when he thought that it was in his own interests to do so (hear, hear).” Hay was an independent. “Partyism” was a curse to any new country.” Needed to unite in interests of our community. But JN went to Ottawa via detour to party convention honouring John A. in Toronto – there JN was much praised and petted, told he would rise to federal cabinet. And he gave up his defence of Manitoba’s interests as a consequence.

FP editorial on finality deal was fierce – JN’s “a traitor, a hired betrayer” -- will now accept federal cabinet office as Minister of Interior. Local legislature is example of “unreasoning, cringing, despicable servility and venality.” In editorial “The Accepted ‘Better Terms’” [nd, probably 30 March 1885]

MFP 31 March 1885 – C. S. Douglas said he approved the subsidy in lieu of provincial control of public lands because fed grant of “$100,000 annually in perpetuity” was more than province could hope to attain otherwise.

*The Times* 31 March said the principal claim that Manitoba has always urged is that Manitoba had not the same privileges accorded to her as the other provinces had when they entered the Union.

*The Sun* invites Norquay to resign. 31 March 1885.

*The Commercial* ca. 10 April 1885 “The Better Terms?” also condemns Norquay “being famed for the pliability of his own backbone”

*The Times* 11 April 1885– JN gave notice in house that he would move provincial aid to HBR

*The Times* 14 April 1885 – house passes resolution unanimously (JN agree) that troubles in NW were far distant and did not affect MB and shd not deter immigrants who can come “in the most perfect security.”

MFP 24 March 1886, [LLM 153] – Greenway resolution – CPR completed, Manitobans had been led to believe disallowance wld then end – petition GGIC praying “no further interference with our rights as a legislature in this respect.”

JN reply – yes, he was present with Royal “when this matter was discussed at a time when they were urging upon the federal authorities to change the location of the CPR from the north of Lake Manitoba to the south, and it was deemed in the interests of Canada generally, and not to conflict with the interests of the province, that while the question of the location of the CPR was in abeyance that any railway legislation should be suspended by the province, or at least be subject to the approval of the authorities at Ottawa. At the time that was not an unreasonable request upon the part of the authorities; and in an informal manner they stated that they would submit this to the legislature, but did not undertake to bind the legislature because they had not been invested with any power with regard to that special subject. All they were entrusted with was to urge the change in the location of the CPR.” As for ending the policy when the CPR was completed, the BNA Act s. 91 and 92 “there will always be a doubt as to whether the legislature could charter a line to make connection with a line beyond the boundary of the province. The House may charter to the boundary and if by any means, that line should make connection with others passing the province, it was a federal business to say whether that line should proceed to operation or not…. He [the speaker] thought the constitution plainly lays down that they do possess the power of disallowance, although that power should be guarded.” [MFP 25 March LLM 153\ *The Daily Manitoban* 25 March 1886. [LLM p 154] Greenway’s resolution was defeated 19-8.

**MFP 4 May 1885: very partisan** account of the debate: Greenway moved a want of confidence motion. Norquay insisted this was out of order and, according to MFP, the opposition laughed at him: “Hon. Mr. Norquay kicked strenuously against having the motion put, but seeing no hope of escaping in that direction (after examining several large volumes on Parliamentary practice which he had brought down from the library) he proceeded to hurl a storm of invective and imprecations against the Opposition, directing his vindictive thrusts mainly against Mr. Conklin, who had been active in unearthing the scandals referred to in the report. The Premier’s senseless denunciations were met with roars of laughter from the Opposition which worked him into a state of passion that must have been painful to his supporters.”

After more denunciation from Conklin, Norquay spoke again, “in a sarcastic strain, using a bitterness of language which indicated that his anger was thoroughly aroused. He said he could scarcely characterize by words strong enough the attempt to spring such a motion upon the House at the last moment …for the purpose of creating an impression throughout the country that was entirely false. The movers would find themselves mistaken in their little game which could only emanate from little minds. He felt that when he had had the confidence of the country for fourteen years, the miserable insinuations contained in the resolution would be futile. He had been known in the country longer than his opponents had been in it, and where he was best known he was most trusted.” As for the Sask Coal Co, “had he not been connected with that company he would have advised a gift of $5000 or $6000 because of what that company had done to reduce the price of coal.” He addressed a range of issues, until the opposition began to ask if he had views on the war in Egypt or the price of wheat. The motion was not put to the vote because the Lieutenant Governor had arrived, a half-hour ahead of the time announced for the prorogation, and he proceeded to give assent to bills and thereby to end the debate in the House. He then withdrew “and the members shortly after dispersed without the usual demonstrations of good feeling on the part of the Government.” This was the sitting of Saturday 2 May.

Winnipeg *Times* editorial4 May 1885: “a mean, contemptible trick” – the motion should have been ruled out of order, but the Speaker did not do so. “In a thin House he attempted to rush through a want of confidence motion and discredit the Government to a certain extent in the eyes of the country. But he miserably failed…” seven Govt supporters were absent, only one of Opposition. “It was a contemptible piece of political trickery all through.”

Greenway, a year later, noted in House that he had regretted having to introduce a motion of non-confidence but “the Premier stood up and talked until His Honour came down and prorogued the House.” MFP 9 March 1886. *The Daily Manitoban* put it that Greenway’s speech said: “the Premier had talked away on all manner of subjects until His Honour came and prorogued the House.” [*Daily Manitoban*, 9 March 1886]

***The Times account*** of the debate is in its 4 May edition too: “Greenway’s Game: An Attempt to Outvote the Government during the Absence of Several Members: A Dirty Political Trick in which the Grit Leader was Foiled”. Greenway insisted he could bring a motion of non-confidence at any time. Norquay said he had to give “due notice” describing the motion as “the most ungentlemanly, unworthy and unprecedented attack upon a government” that had the confidence of the House. It had revealed all the accounts, members on both sides had found mistakes and errors, there had been no attempt at concealment “as there was nothing wrong.” Conklin feared that, without such scrutiny, the Govt “would have been allowed to continue to squander the people’s money.” Norquay was shocked that the opposition was using such claims to take advantage of the Govt.

Norquay then “addressed the House in an able and eloquent speech.” Greenway had been searching for issues “upon which he thought he could assail the Government.” Now they try this expedient “when members of this House have largely gone home. He did not believe such a procedure could be found in the annals of any legislature in the universe – of a motion of such importance ever sprung upon a Government enjoying the confidence of the country.” The issues mentioned had been expenditures for the public good. Rather than “a fair and impartial investigation” of the accounts, opposition members had been using the committee “to carry on the war of prejudice against the Government.”

***The Times editorial*** 4 May 1885: “a mean, contemptible trick” – the motion should have been ruled out of order, but the Speaker did not do so. “In a thin House he attempted to rush through a want of confidence motion and discredit the Government to a certain extent in the eyes of the country. But he miserably failed…” seven Govt supporters were absent, only one of Opposition. “It was a contemptible piece of political trickery all through.”

Greenway, a year later, noted in House that he had regretted having to introduce a motion of non-confidence but “the Premier stood up and talked until His Honour came down and prorogued the House.” MFP 9 March 1886. *The Daily Manitoban* put it that Greenway’s speech said: “the Premier had talked away on all manner of subjects until His Honour came and prorogued the House.” [*Daily Manitoban*, 9 March 1886]

**1886 4th Session, 5th Legislature – 4 March 1886 to 28 May 1886 – 55 sitting days**

Pp 122-263: *Daily Manitoban, Le Manitoba, and Manitoba Free Press,*  also *Sun*

**MFP 29 May 1886:** **“Expiring Legislature”**

Norquay, MacBeth and Murray are old Red River. The other 26 came in last 20 years.

Sutherland, died spring 1884, was MacBeth’s kinsman. [are they all metis?]

Miller represented “Ontario” riding, “had to make himself scarce as a result of the famous McCormick flogging case” – became Registrar General.

Hamilton replaced Killam (appted judge) in Wpg South.

Kittson died, replaced by Cyr.

La Verendrye: Goulet unseated, Prudhomme became judge, young Prendergast

Emerson: Burnham unseated, C S Douglas won

3 journalists – La Riviere *Le Manitoba*, Douglas (Emerson *International*), Cyr – french

3 lawyers – Hamilton, MacBeth, Joe Martin

8 farmers – not including Norquay but including Greenway

2 Dominion Land surveyors – Brown and Crawford

2 doctors – Wilson and Harrison

The rest in commercial pursuits (about 11)

Allan was officer in Red R expeditionary force, Lecomte in Papal Zouaves, Tennant in (British?) regular army

Wagner is grandson of a Prussian officer in Napoleonic Wars. He came to Canada “37 years ago” [FP 13 March 1886]

**Throne Speech 4 March 1886**: *The Daily Manitoban* 4 March 1886

CPR complete, good harvest, more railway mileage in branch lines, proud of volunteers who helped “in support of law and order”.

Resol’n to accept Dominion offer “as settlement of province’s claims upon Canada”

Redistribution and a measure to extend the franchise and make provision for voting by ballot.

**Manitoban 5 March 1886**: Norquay on question of privilege (first day of debates)– reports of speeches by Greenway [21 August 1885]and Martin (re ‘coal steal’ in Birtle at dinner for Robt Watson, 17 Feb 1886]), and a letter by Hay (MPP for Norfolk, Free Press 27 Feb. 1886) re refusal to allow him on a special train to Holland. JN said it was time for members who make such charges to have to be responsible for their words. Moves that a Royal Commission be appointed.

MFP 9 March 1886: Greenway moved want of confidence. The trip by delegates to Ottawa cost too much -- $3628.25. Russell House cost $150 for 30 days, and train cost $150 = $300. Plus asylum, printing costs, bookkeeping system. Martin explained coal issue as one of SK Coal troubles, JN asked for aid because it had cut coal costs, committee of Leg proposed a loan of $2000 to be repaid in coal the following winter – opposition said this was illegal and should not be repeated. Martin read an article from *The Sun* which said the money never reached the company but was “paid into the bank to retire a note on which the Premier was personally liable; and that every pound of coal delivered to the Government had been paid for apart from this sum.” This newspaper was charging him with “personal dishonesty of the grossest kind.”

JN replied. Vote taken 16-8 dftd. [Greenway, Martin, Conklin, Charles Hay, Winram, Bell, Young, Jackson]

In the Throne Speech debate, JN spoke of “the unfortunate troubles that occurred in the west” – and despite “a national feeling” it is “still to be deplored … internecine strife … an unfortunate family difference … it is unfortunate that the circumstances did occur. We must give credit to those who rushed forward for the preservation of law and order.” *The Daily Manitoban* 10 March 1886. [LLM p 130] [re Riel uprising of 1885]

Greenway quotes speech by JN in Emerson on 16th March that the time has not yet arrived when HBR construction is a necessity – notice of resolution for discussion thereon and repudiation of that statement. MFP 19 March, [LLM 146]

MFP 24 March 1886, [LLM 153] – Greenway resolution – CPR completed, Manitobans had been led to believe disallowance wld then end – petition GGIC praying “no further interference with our rights as a legislature in this respect.”

JN reply – yes, he was present with Royal “when this matter was discussed at a time when they were urging upon the federal authorities to change the location of the CPR from the north of Lake Manitoba to the south, and it was deemed in the interests of Canada generally, and not to conflict with the interests of the province, that while the question of the location of the CPR was in abeyance that any railway legislation should be suspended by the province, or at least be subject to the approval of the authorities at Ottawa. At the time that was not an unreasonable request upon the part of the authorities; and in an informal manner they stated that they would submit this to the legislature, but did not undertake to bind the legislature because they had not been invested with any power with regard to that special subject. All they were entrusted with was to urge the change in the location of the CPR.” As for ending the policy when the CPR was completed, the BNA Act s. 91 and 92 “there will always be a doubt as to whether the legislature could charter a line to make connection with a line beyond the boundary of the province. The House may charter to the boundary and if by any means, that line should make connection with others passing the province, it was a federal business to say whether that line should proceed to operation or not…. He [the speaker] thought the constitution plainly lays down that they do possess the power of disallowance, although that power should be guarded.” [MFP 25 March LLM 153 and *The Daily Manitoban* 25 March 1886. [LLM p 154] Greenway’s resolution was defeated 19-8.

The Greenway HBR resolution – JN spoke in explanation of his remarks – he had been talking about the CPR, and someone interjected a question about the HBR. I replied, said JN, “it was not a necessity in the light that I had just pointed out; the CPR was a necessity … [the HBR was] not a necessity for the maintenance of the Dominion in the light the CPR is.” The HBR is important. There is a “standing offer” of $1 million for the company that builds it and connects to the CPR in Manitoba. I said the HBR was “an immediate necessity” in 1884, when we had no connection to the seaboard, but now we do and I say that the HBR is “not an immediate necessity.” But, also, “I know the road will become a reality, and the sooner it becomes such the better for the country. (Cheers).” Consider the reverse. If I said Manitoba could not survive without the HBR, people would not come. “I am not one of those who are willing to depreciate my country for the sake of gaining a party advantage. (Hear, hear). I will not for the sake of gaining a party advantage drag the prospects of my native province in the dust.”

JN – Manitoba has 812 miles of railway and 100,000 population. This is a good ratio compared to other places such as “many portions of QC and ON” (hear, hear): “When we consider that we are only on the threshold of railway enterprise, we should to a large extent feel satisfied with our lot as far as railway enterprise is concerned.” The price of coal has been cut in half between 1882 and 1885. Norquay’s amendment to the HBR Greenway resolution noted MB requests to extend provincial boundary to HB, and the negotiations to merge two companies to build a single line with a bonus of 6400 acres per mile, etc, etc – this House pledges “to do everything in its power to hasten the construction of the HBR” and to support the president of the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway and Steamship Navigation Company” [Hugh Sutherland] in his negotiations in London “to float the bonds of said company.” Carried 18-8. *The Daily Manitoban* 25 March 1886. [LLM p 155-157]

Joe Martin and Dr. Wilson became very heated when the debate resumed the next day, the words “coward, contemptible sneak” were uttered, a fist fight threatened “The scene was an animated one and was greatly enjoyed by the spectators in the gallery.” *The Daily Manitoban* 26 March 1886. [LLM p 162]

27 March 1886 – ***Manitoban*** – JN introduces legislation providing that there shall be no appeal from judgments under Master and Servants Act – said it wld be “of great value to the working classes, and will protect them from dishonest employers, who often appeal cases in order to gain time and in the hope that their unpaid men may not be able to fight the matter through.” On 1 April ***Free Press*** report he said the bill “had been framed in accordance with the expressed wishes of the working men.” The bill was moved in second reading. The 1 April 1886 – ***Manitoban*** recorded this as: “Mr. Norquay believed the measure a good one, it nhaving been framed with the expressed wish, and for the protection of, the working class.” MFP 10 April – passed 3rd reading. [It was discussed again in 1887, noted in 19 May 1887 ***Free Press***, and JN again said he had met with a deputation of workingmen of Wpg, and Govt had concern for “the feelings and interests of the poor man”

JN not involved but much discussion of duck hunting and how to ensure conservation and yet provide for people’s food needs.

Qualification of provincial voters – new law – men must have an income of at least $300 per year -- not, as in past, property valued at $100. Or, as in federal elections, real estate of $150. It contained the introduction of the ballot. One member, Hamilton, cabinet minister, said that except for BC which had adopted “the manhood sufffrage,” and perhaps PEI, this was “more liberal” than any other province and even than the Dominion Act of last session. “If a man could not qualify under these very liberal provisions, he could hardly claim to be entitled to vote at all.” He, like LaRiviere, preferred “the straightforward open mode” but members and public seemed to prefer the latter and he accepted that. **Norquay** said much the same – he preferred the other, but “in the interests of peace and contentment,” he would “yield” to “meet what the country generally believed was in the interests of the public.” RE enumeration: He also claimed that his govt in making appointments “invariably regarded merit, no matter to which side it belonged,” and said his opponents “on a certain occasion” took the first opportunity “to oust from positions gentlemen appointed by their predecessors.” MFP 30 March 1886

*The Manitoban* report 31 March added re JN – his emphasis on importance of enumeration being unbiased. [this is the context of above]. He concluded: “He had to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon introducing such a comprehensive measure.” [it was La Riviere – obviously JN not involved]

The Opposition then moved an amendment that “ladies be empowered to vote” – supported by MacBeth, Douglas, Martin, Jackson, Crawford, Mawhinney: Defeated. ***Manitoban*** recorded vote at 9-6, has a little – good comments -- on the debate. JN not present for vote.[167]

30 March session in Manitoban 31 March 1886 – JN in answer to question about aid to MSWR as last year, said they had been asked and provided assistance in 1885 and would help again if asked but they had not been asked yet. [167]

*Free Press* 1 April 1886- records Martin’s notice of a motion re this flogging

*Free Press* 1 April 1886 – Disallowance – Hamilton introduces resolution – re Emerson and Northwestern Rly and also Manitoba Central Railway – had not yet received official notice of said action, but he wanted to know the reasons for this action. Was it alleged to be beyond province’s constitutional powers, or was “considered to be in the interest of the Dominion as a whole.” [168]

Greenway insisted that in the bdy of the old province, the govt cld charter rlys without hindrance. After the 1881 Extension Act, it could not charter rlys within 15 miles of border in the newly-added territory. Norquay was shifting his ground “in casting doubts upon the powers of the Legislature, and asking whether they had a right to charter lines running tdo the boundary.” He was looking at matters from the Dominion govt’s “standpoint.” Yet both sides unanimously agreed in 1884 that they they had the right within the old province. “All admitted the policy was wrong and not in the interests of this country.” We need additional outlets to US. People are leaving. The Libs claimed Tupper had promised to end disallowance as soon as the line north of Lake Superior had been completed. Motion dftd 17-7, JN voted. [168-69]

***The Manitoba Sun*** will be independent and “absolutely impartial” 6 April 1886 [176a]

8 April 1886 [178] *The Sun* : “The present session of the legislature has been so far remarkable for the number of scenes which have occurred in the House.” Questions of privilege, strong language, insinuations and recriminations.

Lowering the level of the Assiniboine and shortening the river by cutting through turns, and drainage in general. MFP and Daily Manitoban -- 9 April 1886

JN’s act on the sale of intoxicating liquors – follows the Ontario Act -- the McCarthy Act – *Manitoban* 10 and 13 April 1886, *MFP* 13 April – JN – “prohibition of what everybody considered an evil; yet the community in this province had always thought it best heretofore to regulate the matter and surround it with as stringent regulations as possible so as to keep the evil, which all admitted it was, within as circumscribed limits as possible. It was a subject upon which a great deal of sentiment and wisdom had been expended with a view to reduce the indulgence in intoxicating liquors.” MFP 13 April 1886. *The Manitoban* recorded discussion in committee – JN presented the views of a clergy and prominent citizen delegation on the level of fees – very high -- said “He would like to see the sale of liquor surrounded by every legitimate precaution, but there was no use in making conditions so hard that to comply with them would amount to prohibition. That would only force people to the illegitimate sale of liquor, and would cause a great deal more evil to be done.”

*The Manitoban* 21 April 1886 – re Souris and Rocky Mountain and Northwest Central Rly – Leacock says its charter and land grant has been subject of speculation since 1881 – Legislature should telegraph rly committee of H of C urging generous grant be made for sake of settlers in that country. At his urging the Premier had joined the Board of the rly in 1884 – “to check the speculators from the east.” They were playing for advantage on the New York stock market while settlers faced snow storms and drifts.

Norquay says he joined the board only so that Manitoba might have representation there. “Last summer he had gone to New York to ascertain the financial standing of gentlemen with whom negotiations were in progress… His object was to see if there was good prospect of the road going on, and he believed that if certain legislation were secured the road would be in operation some time during the present summer.” He expressed regret that people were blackening his name for his association therewith.

MFP 30 April 1886 – ‘the judicial tax” -- in reply to Greenway, JN made a long detailed speech on judicial costs and the policy that local taxation should pay for a significant portion thereof[201] *The Manitoban* 30 April 1886 added detail – that JN said the opposition were seeking to make “a lot of cheap capital with which to go to the country, but the result would be the same as at the last election… Defeat met them, as it would do now.” Much detail on expenditures and needs of province followed – JN prepared for this speech. “Take the item of education. This is an item shared in by the richest and lowest. It spreads its beneficial effects on the rich and poor alike.” ON spends 27 cents a head; QC 26c. MB 80 cents. But he then shifted ground and agreed to place costs of “administration of justice” on province rather than local municipal govts. Greenway tried to demonstrate that the govt did not report accurately, hid expenses – “The people had reason to believe, from the public accounts, that there exists somewhere in the swamps of Manitoba an asylum; but all the expenses of that institution had not found their way into the public accounts yet.”

*Sun:*  30 April 1886 and MFP 1 May 1886, *Daily Manitoban*  30 April 1886: Joe Martin expressed great surprise – such a reversal of position – “He had been in the House for nearly four years; he had seen the Premier make many a sudden turn.” Why now? surely not just better terms – could have done it last year if that was the reason – no “It is because the honourable gentleman is beginning to feel shaky and to appreciate the fact that the elections were at hand…. They would do anything to keep in power.” In speaking Martin referred to the “coal steal.” Norquay “interjected a remark that the money was paid back all right. Mr. Martin retorted that it was only paid in the same way a thief would pay when he was caught stealing.” [205] Manitoba needed public men who “were prepared to stand up not for the Government at Ottawa but for the rights of the people of this province.” “It was the boast of the Premier that he had been in power 14 years….”

And when Martin mocked Norquay’s reference to 14 years, Norquay came back with the sally that Martin, “will never be able to make such a boast,” Martin shot back that “that was not a question of importance, but a personal one which should be left entirely out.” “because, no matter what Government was in power, and though at one time one set of men and one set of principles had prevailed, and at another time another set of men and another set of principles all the time John Norquay was in the Government. That was the reason why Conservatives had lost confidence in him.” JN and his govt will lose the next election.

*Sun:*  30 April 1886 –Leacock resolution of the Northwest Central Rly – “People like Mr. Beaty who had done what he had to keep the people from securing railway facilities should be taught a lesson. All he wanted was to traffic in the charter and make money out of it. The lands had been given for the people and should so be used.” The motion was carried and a resolution telegraphed to Ottawa.

Leacock became a visible figure during this session, bustling through the halls, speaking on the floor of the House, pushing his causes and his district in meetings of the Government party.

**MFP 1 May 1886**: “Returns respecting cost of trips to Ottawa”: [207]

1875 – Davis - $2004

1878 – Norquay - $797.75

1879 – Norquay - $1175 plus Begg, Gouin, Walker -- $2105.28

1880 – “ - $1502. Plus 3 others – total = $1844

1881 – “ - $150 plus 9 others – total = $1174

1882 – “ - $1900 plus 1 other – total = $1978.96

1883 - 2 others total = $1175

1884 – “ - $2628.25 plus 3 others total = $3753.25

1885-6 – “ - $500 plus 1 other total = $850

Grand total = $16,325.54. [207]

MFP 4 May 1886 – Thomas Spence petitioned to have a “superannuation allowance in consideration of his having been a civil servant for fourteen years and having devoted his life in Manitoba to the promotion of immigration and the development of the province.” Greenway snipped: “That’s another fourteen years man.” [Like Norquay, of course] Referred to public accounts comittee.

*Manitoba Sun:*  4 May 1886 – Nothing has been done in the House, despite its being in session – with breaks – for two months. “What in thunder the Government can be thinking about no one can tell, but there is no disguising the fact that they have not been ready with the work.” Yet it goes on to discuss municipal bill in another story and the decision to take over the admin of justice.

*Daily Manitoban* 5 May 1886 – Hector Langevin replied that the MB telegram had been read to the Rly Committee, and the Northwest Central Rly charter had been revived but wld not be in force unless the Co. builds 50 miles of road by end of present year. If it fails another “good company” will be permitted to incorporate.

*Manitoba Sun:*  5 May 1886 – “The Premier has not been in the House a great deal the last few days, and his absence led to surmises as to the cause. It was learned that the hon. gentleman is preparing to deliver his budget speech one of these evenings. It is said to be the greatest effort of his life, and in order to make it so he has been working away on material for it for some time past.” Perhaps JN will make the HBR a govt project if Sutherland fails and “though he has been keeping as close as a clam, hoping to take everyone by surprise,” he may make this the election platform.

MFP 7 May 1886 – JN and Greenway tangle again over Northwest Central – JN denies that he went on the board of directors for any reason but to assist rly construction, criticizes Greenway for trying to win partisan advantage. He was not able to do much but he was of some assistance and his only object was “to promote construction as soon as possible.”

MFP 12-13 May 1886, *Daily Manitoban* 13-14 May 1886, *Manitoba Sun:*  13 May 1886: Norquay’s budget speech – familiar references to fdg of province, expenses of early govt and inadequacy of federal financial support, rapidity of development, “progress”, and need for federal govt to increase subsidy – annual delegations, small increases, issue of lands. The grant of $100,000 in lieu of lands is a good deal. And we secured an increase in the province’s size with bdy extension, brought about after tough negotiations and with the aid of fortuitous circumstances, including serious research into the circumstances of Confederation, of other provinces, and of MB itself. [He may also be referring to Riel 1885 here??] And the opposition threatens to fire civil servants bec. the cost of govt is too high and the salaries are extravagant – he wld not, bec they do necessary and valuable work. And printing costs are not excessive. Finally, HBR – it would contribute econ growth “to restore this province to the prosperous position that she held some years ago. The present is a moment when the people of this country are emerging from the despair that followed the late inflation… the one enterprise which would be conducive [to optimism and thoughts of rapid growth] to that effect would be the prosecution and completion of the Hudson Bay Railway. (Cheers)” Will set up committee to consider how to take action. Conclusion greeted with cheers.

MFP 15 May 1886, *Daily Manitoban* 14 May 1886, *Manitoba Sun:*  13 May 1886: Greenway: “He, himself, had entertained hopes of the advance of Manitoba but he had to regret that they had not been realized…. This was, he believed, owing to the unpatriotic policy adopted by the men in power.” High taxes, failure to report honestly on the public lands question and to adhere to the demands of the legislature in 1884, opposed the rly monopoly and the “iniquitous tariff” He had bartered away the rights of the province. FP said he sat down to “prolonged applause.”

*Manitoba Sun:* 13 May 1886 – JN has gone to Neepawa to attend a banquet for J A Davidson, member for Dauphin and will be gone a couple of days.

*Manitoba Sun:* 13 May 1886 – 111,129 acreas of swamp lands given to MB by feds. Aggregate value of lands sold was $23,063,760 (revenue to feds?)

*Manitoba Sun:* 13 May 1886 – HBR – delegation to JN, including Greenway, JS Tupper, WF Luxton, Jas Sutherland to urge govt support for construction. JN made no promises.

*Manitoba Sun:* 19 May 1886 – C. S. Douglas of Emerson “is quite a favourite with Mr. Norquay.” Is a newspaperman

*Manitoba Sun:* 20 May 1886 – series of Liberal motions to eliminate deputy ministers in each dept. Dftd by govt members.

*Daily Manitoban* 20 May 1886 – excellent map of constituencies as a result of redistribution [p 239] – 35 ridings

MFP 22 May 1886 – The electoral map favours old areas (1000 voters for each of 6 ridings on average) penalizes new and rapidly-growing areas (3000 voters for each of 6 ridings in west)

MFP 26 May 1886 [pp 252-253]– Wallbridge report read to legislature on 25th May. Examined witnesses under oath, evidence recorded in shorthand – I was “to inquire whether the charges reflecting on the character and conduct of the first minister have been proven.” Some charges were vague and could not be tested. But I will try the “coal steal” and the “notorious asylum business.”

SK Coal, when in difficulty, and to pay workmen, secured $5000 note at Merchants Bank -- “discounted” – and used money, JN told bank that govt wld take coal to extent of at least $2000. Company agreed to this deal. SK Coal delivered $535 worth of coal by end of April 1884. JN paid to bank $2000 on 4 March – thus the advance was now $1464. This reduced the price of coal to the consumer. On 29 April SK Coal embarrassed, directors resigned, replaced by Ashdown, McKeand, and Shorey. JN was a creditor for $1200 signed the deal and has never repudiated his obligation for that amount. The Govt was also a creditor for $1464, for which JN also signed. JN says the SK Coal Co promised to carry out their agreement re coal delivery. The other $3000 owed the bank was renewed by the new directors plus JE Woodworth, Banning, and JN and subsequently paid by the SK Coal Company. By Feb 1885 coal delivered to Govt exceeded the $2000, and this excludes counting the $535. Ashdown, as v-pres of new company, asked Govt for payment, CP Brown wrote cheque for $375 and then cancelled it on 20 Jan 1885. “Mr. Ashdown admits that Mr. Norquay claimed from him, at least half a dozen times, that this set-off of coal against the advance should be made.” Having paid the $3000, it is hard to understand why the $2000 was regarded differently by JHA. But the SK Co. insisted upon being paid. The govt then paid for the new deliveries of coal -- $2668. JN “had either to come in collision with his colleagues, or pay the money himself. He preferred the latter; and after deducting the price of so much of the coal as had been delivered, and for which they did not claim repayment, he paid the amount thus claimed. I find that Norquay acted “in good faith” in making the deal between coal co and bank, as serving the company and had “no personal interest” in the deal; that the Co. refused to regard the earlier delivery obligation as binding and JN “considered himself in honour-bound to pay, and did pay the money out of his own pocket as a man of honour. That this sum so paid by Mr. Norquay is a total loss to him.”

Asylum: chiefly price and fitness of site: lots 58-61 – 174 acres @ $60/acre = $10,440. JN was interested in about 3 acres of the land. “but before the purchase [JN] had exchanged this quantity with Dr. Young, and he was not at the time of the sale personally interested in any portion of it.” People opposed to the govt valued the land at $5.00/acre. The mayor of Selkirk said the same – for farm land – but this was land within the town: “He admitted, however, on cross-examination that it would be proper to assess that part in the outer two miles – 77 acres at $25 per acre, and the inner two miles – consisting of 97 acres – at $200 per acre. I find the price paid not unreasonable. The values given are very far apart. Mr. Norquay had no interest in the land. The selection as to locality is judicious being near a town, where suppies can be obtained, and near the Red River, into which the sewage can be conducted. These are important advantages…. The natural fall [is] fully adequate to its efficient drainage.”

As to the charge of extravagance in delegations to Ottawa: JN said: “I could go there very cheaply as John Norquay, but when he represented them, the province of Manitoba, he expected to do so as became the province which he represented. In this I concur.”

“In all the charges there is nothing which reflects upon the character or conduct of the Hon. Mr. Norquay.”

*Daily Manitoban* 27 May 1886 – Joe Martin says judge was partisan, the premier was dishonest, and seeking personal gain, spoke for 3 hours then moved non-confidence. Disallowance motion from Greenway followed – both defeated by 19-8. Adjourned at 3:10 am. MFP 28 May 1886 contains full account of speech. Land at Selkirk was at best worth $25/30 per acre, not $60. Martin delivered a sustained and very very vigorous denunciation of Judge Wallbridge and of JN.

*Manitoba Sun:* 27 May 1886 – in disallowance debate, JN said that when CPR “is in perfect operation from ocean to ocean it would then be advisable to petition for a withdrawal of the monopoly.”

Martin and Norquay “cordially dislike each other.” When Martin speaks, “it is all the premier can do to remain in his seat, and he has a constant look in his face as if he would like to give expression to a well known epithet of his when he is disgusted.” Martin “seems to regard the premier as the most dishonest man in the world.” JN left the house during Martin’s speech on Wallbridge report. When JN, by then “overcharged,” spoke, “his pent-up hate …exploded, and he gave that hon. gentleman a piece of his mind. He insinuated that he was not able to go back to the place he had come from in Ontario. Oh wasn’t Mr. Martin mad…. he walked up and down uneasily like a she lion when hungry … All he wanted was to call the premier a liar and to call it to his face, at least so he said. … The Speaker’s silk robe had scarcely swept around the corner out of sight, when Mr. Martin…started for his prey. Mr. Norquay had come out from his seat to the middle of the floor and there he was standing when the following consolatory speech was addressed to him by the member for Portage la Prairie: ‘Norquay, you’re a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ contemptible liar.’ It isn’t often the Premier is fighting mad, but this riled him, and he struck at Mr. Martin with considerable force. Bantam-like and agile Mr. Martin jumped back and parried the blow, and then with fists closed and combs erect the two men hopped around parrying and threatening for a few minutes. Most of the members had sauntered out of the chamber and those who were near by were thunderstruck…. It is fortunate that this is the last session of the present parliament as a great deal of bad feeling exists among some of the members.”

Leacock played an active part in this session and led the defence of JN in reply to Joe Martin. *Sun* 27 May 1886. He said “the premier was not a businessman and so was an easy prey to the shrewd sharp J. H. Ashdown, who according to Col. Mackeand’s statement coaxed him to use his influence to get the government to advance more money to the company. He would just like to hold up the characters of the two men, one the gallant Col who led the troops at Fish Creek and Batoche, and the other, the miserable tinsmith always ready to go back on a fellow when the all mighty dollar was in the question.” Mckeand begged JN to advance $1000 to JHA and was indignant that the issue had been turned to put JN in an embarrassing light. MFP 28 May 1886 added that Leacock claimed the SK Coal coal lowered price by $8/ton.

LaRiviere denied there was a deficiency of $12000 in public accounts – Alex Begg then deputy minister did not take any money “dishonestly” – investigation had shown a shortfall of $3000 and could be accounted for.

***Session of 1887: 14 April to 10 June (38 days) 6th Legislature, 1st session***

Leacock open letter addressed to C. P. Brown, 6 April 1887 – in *Manitoban* 6 April 1887:

“Dear Brown:” you offered me a portfolio in “the administration which you hope to form.” You say your platform is RRV rly (which your late colleagues are already working to develop), “the one vote suffrage” (“the subject, as you are aware, of considerable discussion in the private metings of the party” and which will probably soon become law), the municipal act (which you have amended regularly since 1883), electoral redistribution (which act you were responsible for last session), and govt printing (which you dealt with personally last session). No great public question requires a shift in govt, given the re-election of this administration [on 11 December?] Of your resignation, “I know nothing.” The election was on a strict party basis, with a few candidates as exceptions, and I am a Conservative. I support the leader of the Conservative party, who might be “my dearest enemy” or “my dearest trusted friend,” but he is chosen by the party and we are pledged to him. The grits may be setting a trap for you and others by proposing a coalition.

Opening: *Manitoba Sun* 14 April 1887: many attended, “doubtless attracted hither by the expectations of a scene in which it was thought the government might be defeated.”

*Manitoba Sun* 15 April 1887: much scheming on the eve of the Throne Speech, as Govt caucused in legislature and the opposition and “new combination” members gathered in the Grand Union Hotel. C P Brown was everywhere, in the hotel, “chirpy and pleasant,” and C S Douglas and J M Robinson were there until midnight. “It was felt that if the Government was not beaten today or tomorrow it would have to succumb before the session was over.”

Things simmered down and the political atmosphere cleared, said the *Sun*, as the opposition felt a little chagrin and disgust while the Govt members “beamed with pleasure.”

Throne Speech, 15 April 1887 *Manitoban* – re Thursday 14 April: “an immense concourse of people present”

Victoria’s 50th anniversary as Queen; construct and operate or lease RRV Rly to West Lynne; expedite HBR completion now that 40 miles have been rendered fit for operation under aid under the provisions of the “Railway Aid Act, 1885;” congratulate you on extension of branch rlys, for w. Manitoba; appeal to Imperial Govt for “relief, should the policy of disallowing railway charters, intended to operate wholly within th limits of the old Province of Manitoba, be persisted in by the Federal authorities.” Revisions to court, election, municipal, property, liquor, asylum, agriculture, statistics, and health acts. “I congratulate you on the increased number of immigrants arriving daily” and you will be asked “to provide additional means of information with a view to induce as many as possible” to immigrate to this province. And reorganize the civil service.

Norquay then moved first and second readings of a rly bill, even preceding debate on the reply to the Speech from Throne, because throughout the province this measure is a matter of anxiety and there should be no delay. Before this day, when “the very fate of this beloved Canada of ours was in the balance, as it were, while that great enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, was being pushed forward to completion, we cannot but consider that we would not have been justified in enacting any such measures. Now, Mr. Speaker,” our right to legislate for rlys within the old province can be acted upon. “…in doing this we are only conforming with the wishes of a large portion of the community and with the entire community settled within the province of Manitoba.” Thus my motion. “(Cheers).”

Greenway – JN is inconsistent – did not campaign on this, said we should rest content with disallowance. Now he sees that the people ask urgently for this charter. But will it be disallowed?

2nd reading passed, as did second reading of the “Winnipeg & Southern Rly Co.”

Joe Martin was disappointed that they hadn’t been given the federal govt’s answers as to the reasons for earlier disallowance of Manitoba Central Rly bill. The JN govt was acting today bec. “public opinion has grown so strong that they must renounce the stand” of previous days.

16 April 1887 *Manitoban* – 3rd reading of both bills passed in sitting of Friday, 15 April.

*Morning Call* 19 April 1887 [Acton Burrows, Editor in chief] – notes Kirchoffer made “capital speech” in moving reply to Throne speech – wonderful monarch, and British progress in last half-century. Greenway criticized in reply.

JN then spoke, noting that the opposition took credit for “everything that is meritorious” in govt measures, and blaming govt for everything that is wrong. “The progress of the province has been greater than the progress of any other province. (hear, hear).” One platform plank adopted last fall was encouragement of immigration, including awareness of the possibilities of Imperial Federation and tariff preference and greater immigration of ‘the surplus population’ from Britain – not, as Greenway claimed, a statement in favour of Imperial Federation itself. He teased Greenway a little, noted the Grit claim that they pushed Govt to rly policy, and pointed out some claims in “the great moral daily,” the *Free Press.* “I do say that every effort of mine within the bounds of the constitution shall be adopted to construct independent lines to the south…[and with a few more sentences he then concluded his peroration at 6:00 in the afternoon, to be resumed after dinner] (hear, hear and cheers).”

*Manitoba Sun* 19 April 1887 – on JN: spoke for hour and half, -- “Placing his hands in his pockets and grinning good-humouredly, he started in on one of his bluff games. He accused ‘Tom’ Greenway of dying for office…”

At 8:00 he returned, [*Morning Call* 20 April 1887] starting with results of the election – where Free Press of 11 December said 19 Govt, 14 Opposition, 2 independents. The Govt, he said, had received “unquestionable support.” If it was a close result, as Greenway claimed, there were also 5 opposition seats where a shift of 43 or 44 votes would have elected 5 more govt supporters. Will do all in his power to get railway to south. As a member in Confederation, we are one of many provinces and are “on equal terms and enjoy equal advantages” with the others. He took his seat “amid loud applause.”

C S Douglas said he was an independent Conservative and with others of that view was supporting the govt at this time because of the “very full bill of fare” offered.

Royal assent to two railway bills given on 19 April. *Morning Call*  21 April 1887.

RRVR act – JN introduced -- read 1st time in 20 April 1887 sitting -- *Morning Call* 21 April 1887. JN introduced 2nd reading in 22 April sitting *Morning Call* 23 April 1887 – said the entire house would be unanimous in opinion – “the object…is to supply the means of communication, independent of those already enjoyed by the people of the province, with the southern extremity of the province of Manitoba.” We have passed two bills already, but every available resource must be used to ensure that action is taken. As a public work, it might stand a better chance of being allowed to operate. Debentures for $1 million can be issued. The road will be open to all, not exclusive to one company alone.

Greenway thought it a last resort and hoped it would not be necessary and that every economy be ensured.

*Morning Call* 26 April 1887 – JN moves address of congratulation to Queen Victoria – notes progress of empire, Canada, and Manitoba – from 12,000 to 100,000 population, from crude boats to transcontinental railway – “her reign has been one of the most eventful of all times.” In the arts, sciences, reduction of manual labour to a minimum, etc.

Luxton’s friendship was on display in the opening debate of 1887 session. A F Martin accused JN of “traitorous conduct” in 1874. Luxton, member for Wpg South, who had seemed in good humour and to be making interruptions of a friendly character, intervened and “corroborated” JN’s statement. *The Sun* 19 April 1887.

*The Sun* 20 April 1887 “There is no doubt that public sentiment in this province is very much in earnest on the matter of opposition to the further disallowance of provincial railroad charters.”

Some municipalities had repudiated debts – Leacock motion to inquire into and adopt means of relief and protection for creditors. *The Sun* 20 April 1887. JN estimated the value of the arrearages at nearly $1 million. *Morning Call* 27 April 1887

*Manitoba Free Press*  27 April 1887 – “An Intimation to Mr. Norquay that He Don’t Own the Legislature” – a vote on a disallowance motion that the Govt side watered down. The cabinet all voted with JN, but the total was only 14, opposed by 18 in favour of the stronger criticism of disallowance which spoke of “stagnation in business, of despondency and discontent among the people,” and condemned a policy “which prevents many coming into the country which they know to be at the mercy of one corporation, and is causing many good citizens to leave it.” When the vote was announced, “such a storm of applause went up from the Opposition side as the Legislature has not seen for a long time. Many men in the galleries joined in the applause, which was long continued. Mr. Norquay, Mr. LaRiviere and the rest of the ministers wore a very subdued expression on their faces as though they had at last realized that they don’t carry the present Legislature in their pocket.”

Hagel was defeated by Jackson in Rockwood.

Joe Martin prosecuted for assault after being called a liar by Hagel, and Martin struck him. Martin called the charge “one of the vilest outrages on British justice that he had ever hard of.” Atty General Hamilton thought Martin was “rather inclined to pose as a martyr.” *Morning Call* 29 April, 1887

Mr. Robinson moved a resolution in House: Some Fairford halfbreeds of the old Indian reserve have abandoned the Indian treaty and become white men in the eyes of the law and others now wish to become white men as long as they can receive parcels of land within the reserve– therefore ask feds to let them have land *[Morning Call* 29 April, 1887] Norquay said it was complicated and required careful wording – proposed assistance if the resolution was delayed now. Robinson agreed. Norquay then amended the resolution several days later – see *Morning Call* 4 May, 1887. Fairford and St. Peters are involved, the resolution now said, several parties have abandoned the Indian treaty act and become entitled to exercise of franchise and all privileges of citizenship, and now reside on reserves, be it resolved to ask feds to allow them to continue to live on these lands. Also in “Civilized Indians’ Land Claims” ***Free Press*** 4 May 1887, LLM p 35, 38

*Morning Call* 13 May 1887 – A F Martin resolution calling for one man/one vote, Norquay agreed, said the legislation would soon be tabled and Martin was just trying to anticipate a govt initiative.

McKenzie asked why not lady suffrage as well? “It was selfish for the men to take it all to themselves, and leave the ladies out.”

Norquay said a property qualification was appropriate. He did not favour the ballot but petitions had been sent and now it was conceded. And so was “one man one vote” when the people wanted it. Motion carried.

*Manitoba Free Press* 19 May 1887: Luxton motion asking why did premier go to Ottawa? Norquay said the business was not yet completed and it was better on public grounds of importance that it should not be made public – [it is probable, as he implied, that this was] a matter of “incomplete negotiations.” Martin said it was supposed that the visit had to do with disallowance and, some said, that policy being ended. Luxton then withdrew the motion, but not before Joe Martin made another long critical speech.

Norquay seems to have given an interview to *The Sun* on the RRVR, noting the govt’s determination to hire a good contractor and to get the road built by November – to meet Northern Pacific at bdy.

*Morning Call* 21 May 1887: Geo Stephen’s telegram appeared in the morning’s paper. In the afternoon, Norquay read it to the House, “knowing very well that the contents of that telegram would perhaps influence to a large extent the people of Winnipeg… regarding whom action was contemplated…. ‘I am informed that negotiations are in progress, if not already completed, between your Government and others, and the Northern Pacific railway company, with the view of giving that company an independent connection with Winnipeg. I cannot but regard this as an act of undeserved hostility towards the Canadian Pacific railway, which in the end will do nothing but hurt to Manitoba and the Northwest, and further I consider it a breach of faith toward the holders of the $134,000,000 private capital invested in Canadian Pacific railway securities. If the mischievous agitation in favour of diverting the business of the Northwest into American channels is continued, and the Canadian Pacific railway company is to be treated as a public enemy by the people of Winnipeg, the company will at once take steps to establish their principal western shops at Fort William, which, from an operating point of view, has many advantages, leaving nothing in Winnipeg but the ordinary division shops. Pray do not be mistaken. This is not an idle threat, it is a fixed purpose, taken after full consideration. Geo Stephen President, C.P.R. Co.’

“Continuing, he [Norquay] said: The telegram having been directed to me, I sent the following: ‘Cannot understand how your company can construe contemplated action of Provincial Government to build a railway to southern boundary as breach of faith to holders of Canadian Pacific railway securities. Government is acting on behalf of Province uninfluenced by Winnipeg’s action to C.P.R. or C.P.R.’s contemplated removal of workshops.’

“As the hon. gentleman sat down the House rang with applause, which lasted for a number of seconds.”

*Morning Call* 21 May 1887: LaRiviere then gave budget speech. Notes responsible government and obligation to debate responsibly. Notes federal subsidy increases. Then refers to seven planks of programme in ultimatum: 1) control of public lands; 2) of school lands; 3)increase of capital account; 4)disallowance of rly charters; 5) increase of per capita grant; 6) extension of rlys; 7) effect of the tariff: Notes increase in basis of subsidy via higher population estimate; grant in lieu of lands ($100,000) as consequence of ultimatum. Notes disallowance – and decision to build RRV in order to secure a “competitive line of communication.” Notes growth of branch line mileage. Notes impact of tariff but says the heavy burden perceived in 1883 was reduced sharply in 1884 and 1885 because entrepreneurs stepped in and produced the formerly-imported goods in Canada – eg protective duty of 60 cents/ton on coal – now have Northwest coal. Tariff has contributed to prosperity. The province has “a capital” of about $6 million, no indebtedness. [All very economic, capitalist, market and statistics-driven]

MB does have bonds issued for $2 million to aid rly construction, but this is not properly indebtedness because “this account having been loaned to the respective railway companies who are paying the interest on the same, while the capital is guaranteed by the lands transferred to the province as collateral security, so that this debt will be duly repaid to us by those companies from the proceeds of the sales of the lands.”

The 102 municipalities have assessable property worth $62 million and indebtedness of $5 million – about 8% of worth – not counting personal debts. A half-dozen municipalities have incurred debts that are too great.

On public accounts: income of $578,000; capital account of $486,000; expenditures of $575,500 and on capital account $486,000. Balanced, but with real surplus -- given future rly land returns and infrastructure that is not recurring cost, “we have netted a sum of” $127,000. We must guard against “miscalculated liberality…. It is not wise even upon discounting the future to saddle our province with liabilities that may cause its ruin.”

Greenway spoke, especially emphasizing economy in govt and printing costs. Norquay “refuted” his statements, “clearly showing that Mr. Greenway’s opposition was factious and unwarranted. He was followed by the member for Portage la Prairie, who indulged in an hour and a half’s rambling and disconnected harangue, succeeding effectually (as usual) in driving the people out of the galleries.” Adjourned at 23:50 o’clock.” The report of Martin’s speech in the *Free Press*, by contrast, suggested that it was coherent and had made useful, sensible arguments. *[Free Press* 23 May 1887]

The report in *Le Manitoba* 26 May, declared that Martin renewed his attack of last year on the French element in the province and said there were too many French deputies in the House.

*Morning Call* 1 June 1887 – in a debate that started with criticisms of LaRiviere, who had called on the French to stand united against the rest in the election of last year. Greenway said LaR had called his Liberal party “enemies of the French..” Yes, LaR said, he controlled the newspaper.

Martin replied – the French held the balance of power in the province, and the Govt has a margin in the House of only 4 votes, whereas LaRiviere controlled 5.

*Morning Call* 23 May 1887: long coverage of Norquay’s “powerful and exhaustive” speech on the budget – he notes relevance of responsible govt example, especially because of Britain’s reluctance to grant it to colonies – and now Manitoba was “undergoing the same ordeal and constitutional experience that Canada underwent before she received responsible government from the Mother Country…. Whenever the question of disallowance or monopoly was mentioned the patent argument ready at all seasons for them [friends in the east] to use was that as the east had expended the money and credit in constructing their railway they must receive their trade as some small return for what had been done…. He believed… that had we not become a portion of Canada our progress would not have been so rapid…” Population from 12000 (1870) to 108,000 (1886). We admire what has been done to connect this country via the railway. We see “tighter… bonds of loyalty that we had to the mother country and feelings of kinship to the eastern portion of Canada. These might perhaps be considered questions of sentiment, but when they carried with them weighty results, when they carried with them the means of interchange not only of courtesies but of business and commercial relations then they had to view that great undertaking [CPR] not from such a limited standpoint, as a provincial standpoint but from the wider and more general application of the term, that of a Dominion standpoint.” He spoke of the jaundiced opposition seeing the world through “yellow spectacles (laughter)” and when he lost a page of tables he said the opposition must have “purloined it (laughter).” He taunted Joe Martin, provoking more laughter, and he rallied his followers with defences of government practices in education and printing and its federal grants.

Did he steal opposition ideas? “Childlike, when they get anything into their brains they cannot keep it to themselves and when we carry it into effect they say we are stealing their thunder.” *Free Press* 23 May 1887]

Martin and Norquay and others swarmed around each other at the end of debate on contracts for the excavation of drains near Portage – “excitement ran high for a while but it soon quieted down, and the members departed.” [“considerably after midnight said the *Call* on 25 May] the rest comes from report on 21 May sitting, in *Free Press* 24 May 1887

Opposition motions are being defeated 20-14, 19-15 *Morning Call* 27 May 1887.

16-13, *Call* 1 June

*The Sun* 27 May 1887: Debate on printing contracts, Luxton vs. Govt (and its newspaper friends). Dr. Harrison then alleged that the *Free Press* was “bought over some 13 years ago to support Mr. Davis, the price being the liquidation of a mortgage upon the paper for $5000, held by Magnus Brown.

“Mr. Luxton jumped up in a great state of excitement, and charged that the assertion was false. He asked Mr. Norquay if he would not corroborate him in his denial.

“But Mr. Norquay did not do it worth a cent. On the contrary, he rose and stated that at the time referred to Mr. Luxton drove down to his (Norquay’s) place, twelve miles from the city, and asked him to go up to the city, as there was some contemplation of a change in the attitude of the party which had been elected to oppose the government of the day. He came up to the city and suggested that there should be a compromise between the opposition and the government. Mr. Luxton told him unless a compromise were effected he could not go on with his paper; that there was a mortgage against it for $5000, which Mr. Davis, the then premier, had secured, and as he (Luxton) was in opposition to him (Davis) the latter was in a position to snuff him out. Mr. Norquay told him if that was so they [the opposition] would fight the government without an organ. No arrangement was made at that time, but subsequently Mr. Luxton went down to see him again and urged him to go up. He did so, and at a meeting of the members of the opposition it was arranged that he (Norquay) should take a seat in the Davis government, and that the *Free Press* should become its organ. Thereby the printing contract was preserved to the *Free Press* and the paper changed politics… [in *Morning Call* this is put: “the paper which had hitherto been in opposition to the Government should become a Government organ, which was done.” *Call* 28 May 1887]

“Mr Luxton, warmly – ‘I denounce the statement of the premier as an absoute falsehood.’

“Hon. Mr. Norquay – ‘You know it’s true, and if Mr. Davis were here he would corroborate it.’”

Dr. Harrison then went on: Luxton over-charged for printing. His contract expired. *The Times* got the contract at the end of 1881. And Luxton/Kenny lost the bid in 1886 to *The Manitoban*. The Canadian Printing Co. also bid – perhaps French?

[Despite the huge issues looming in the provincial sphere as the summer of 1887 commenced, legislative debates ran in the same old channels and with little mention of the big matters – even of a giant [HBR?] meeting in Winnipeg where Norquay had received a huge ovation.]

Lt Gov gave royal assent to RRV rly on 1 June. *Call* 2 June 1887

Norquay, to applause, introduced bill on aid to HBR on 1 June. *Call* 2 June 1887

Thursday 2 June – house adjourned early in honour of the Norquays’ silver wedding [2 June 1862 - 1887]. The members of the House presented him with gifts, including two large chairs ($100), a pipe (calumet) of peace, and a box of cigars, and a “costly” dinner set of 150 pieces. One presenter spoke of the “personal esteem” in which he was held. He was also given three cheers for “the old man,” Greenway congratulated him, and members then got into carriages for a tour through the city, including the new district of Fort Rouge south of the Assiniboine River and the new City Hall on Main Street. In the evening a huge party was held at the “gaily illuminated” Norquay home on Hallet St and under a marquee on the tennis grounds across the street. *Morning Call* 3 June 1887 – “Mrs. Norquay does not enjoy the best of health at any time, but she was remarkably well last night…”

Long list of presents from a long list of notable citizens – pins, pitchers, flower stands, canes, a “costly silver service,” goblets, salad bowl etc. The evening featured a dance to “the strains of Marrotta’s orchestra” – the program listed twenty-three dances – which ran until an early hour the next day. Nearly all members of House were there. *Free Press* 3 June 1887

*Free Press* 7 June 1887: JN on a question of privilege noted that the *Call* said the anniversary gifts were intended as “a recognition of his political career” – this was not so – would place friends and opponents in an embarrassing position – “he had accepted the presentation as to himself individually. And not as connected with any political party. (Applause).”

*Morning Call* 4 June 1887: JN took over the municipalities bill (LaR was away), which dealt with threat of default by a half-dozen, including Portage and Emerson. He said this was not a party measure on which the government’s fate was hanging but he believed, given that the province would be seeking $1 million “in the money markets of the world,” [note this view of money and markets] they should look favourably on granting support to the local governments in need and thereby “hold themselves up before the world and show they are meeting their honest obligations. He did not think that anything could possibly more materially affect this country to its disadvantage than repudiation of liabilities at the present moment.” The bill passed 2nd reading as he proposed. Joe Martin strongly supported it but Greenway disagreed with Martin. Leacock had chaired the committee that prepared the bill. [also Free Press, 4 June 1887]

He then presented a bill on taxation of railways which would limit taxes on these most valuable and highly-desired items of infrastructure to the level of surrounding farmlands, in the case of track beds and all superstructure thereon. It would be exempt from taxation. It had been part of the law since 1883 but had been repealed by mistake during the consolidation of the municipal act last year. The lines had been extended on the understanding that they would not be taxed. Joe Martin “vigorously attacked the proposition.” He did not support legislation favourable to the CPR, given that “it had just insulted the province” and given its many other mean acts and threats. The debate was adjourned without resolution on a motion by Leacock, who said that upon its return to the floor he “would take occasion to express his opinion of the Canadian Pacific in language as unmistakable as that of the member for Portage.”

*Morning Call* 7 June 1887 – minor skirmish on the tenders for construction of RRVR, raised by Luxton, which had gone out, presumably, in recent days.

*Morning Call* 7 June 1887 JN moved second reading of bill on HBR aid: the House had voted $1.5 million to encourage a project but promoters had deemed that amount insufficient. They came back and proposed the House “guarantee interest on $4,500,000 which at 4% would involve this House in a liability of $180,000 a year, but so great was the feeling in favour of this enterprise that, though this was an enormous amount to to settle upon the province with a population of only about 100,000, yet it was deemed necessary….” If it came to pass, the House would “be obliged to resort to direct taxation to furnish the means to carry on this enterprise and he thought they might just as well deal with it in the outset and look it squarely in the face, for he claimed no government could run the country and take $180,000 from its resources without some means of seuring that amount.” This act is proposed “more as a tentative measure, more to bring the matter to a focus, for so long as the Government and the promoters were discussing the matter, there would not be any decision arrived at, and though the Government bring down the measure, they are not wedded to it.” Let us send it to committee, amend it, and get it passed. Greenway accused JN of trying to kill the HB railway because the only Company that could meet the tender requirements was the CPR.

Dr. Harrison was glad to see that Greenway’s opinion of Hugh Sutherland was that the promoter was not necessarily pursuing the province’s best interest. The House had tried to aid Sutherland in 1883, offering him the chance to issue debentures for $1 million on the authority of this province “to float the road on the English markets.” He failed, and came back again in 1884 with a proposal based on $4.5 million of the bonds at 4%. The House again complied but on the condition that the support be tendered only after the road was complete. That offer was held open for a year but Sutherland failed again. In the spring of 1885 “he was back again asking that the offer should be held open longer in view of the troubles on the other side of the water. The Government said go on and we will give you another year yet in which to float your scheme…” He failed. “In the fall of 1886 he got further assistance, but he has failed in that. It had been stated last winter that Mr. Sutherland had $4,000,000 in the bank and he was going to use it in the spring. Where is it? he asked and where are those 200,000 ties?”

“A voice – ‘They are growing.’”

[Harrison]: “He thought Mr. Sutherland was not the most responsible man in Winnipeg after alll these statements which he had made, to say the least of it.” The Government had tried to get the project going but the conditions laid down by that company “that they would be the money of the country and use it as they pleased and the people of this country would not go to this length.” We want a railway to HB, whether by Sutherland or someone else and we don’t want our money squandered.

Joe Martin said they were trying to discredit the HB railway project. The present bill was “a vile act” that would kill the road and that was the Gov’t’s intent. Put it to a general election. “Yet in England or the other provinces one never heard of the Government promising measures in the Speech from the Throne, and then asking for a committee of the House to tell them what these measures should be. The Government’s position here was a very halting, absurd and ridiculous one; it simply meant ‘We are here and we propose to stay. We will offer you a suggestion, but if you don’t like it, we will take it back.’” [*Free Press* 7 June 1887]

“Hon. Mr. Norquay said he was perfectly willing to take the sense of the country on the bill. He said: ‘I am going to carry the scheme through the House, amended as I say, slightly, and I am prepared to go before the country again and beat you on the other side, as I did before.”

HBR bill passed 2nd reading unanimously.

*Morning Call* 8 June 1887 – Luxton: Need better HBR bill -- Govt should “be prepared to stand or fall by every detail; it was not the duty of the Opposition to lead the Government. (Ministerial cheers).” Norquay shot back “You wish you could.” Luxton: ‘No I don’t.” Norquay: “I am glad you are satisfied with your position.” Luxton: I do not say I am satisfied. (Laughter).”

*Free Press* 8 June 1887 – evening: more on HBR bill – JN says re 1886 attempt – “On September 6th the Government had received a telegram from Mr Sutherland, then in England, asking them whether they would issue debentures on the road, taking the land grant as security, and the Government had replied that they would do so if 40 miles of railway were built that fall. Upon his arrival here Mr. Sutherland made a formal application for the assistance so promised…” Govt was bound by promise in telegram and did so. The House rose at 11:45.

*The Sun* 8 June 1887 – JN on railway taxation bill – closed the debate and the bill passed 2nd reading 18-8

Mr. Gelley of Cartier is fun-loving, only 27, an Independent who has generally voted with the Govt.. *The Sun* 6 June 1887

*Morning Call* -- 9 June 1887 – 7 June sitting: JN “could not conceive why there was such a marked hostility to the C.P.R.” They were developing an alternative outlet for export shipments but this was not “adopted in any spirit of retaliation., nor with a spirit of hostility to the C.P.R. but with a desire of promoting the best interests of the people of the province.” An alleged insult was not enough to provoke such a bill or to cause abandonment of the rail shops in Winnipeg. Should pass bill on rly taxation that had been repealed inadvertently last year. Adjourned at 23:55 – and adjournments around midnight to 1:00 every night this week as House approaches prorogation.

8 June sitting: C S Douglas was accused by Joe Martin of attending a caucus of the Liberals in the Grand Union Hotel “and signifying a willingness to turn the present leader of the Government out.” Douglas replied that it was a Conservative caucus that the Liberals had entered. He supported the govt because it promised a RRV Rly. He had earlier agreed to join the opposition with this goal in mind but the Govt had adopted this policy and JN promised to deliver.

*The Sun* 9 June 1887 – Kenneth McKenzie (Lakeside) is highland Scot, Opposition member, pioneer farmer on Portage plain, made an independent fortune in mixed farming, worth, it is said, “a couple of hundred thousand dollars.” Farmers’ union member during its time

*Morning Call* -- 10 June 1887 – widows and married women’s vote in municipal elections – Leacock opposed – McKenzie said “if women possessed property qualifications they could vote as intelligently as any man in Manitoba.” Leacock said, ok, not just widow or married but “all women owning property.” Amended to add at least 21 years of age and subjects of Her Majesty.”

*Morning Call* -- 10 June 1887:HBR – bill would give guarantee of 4% on $4.5 million.

*The Sun* 9 June 1887 – Greenway preferred adjournment, not prorogation, in case of emergency with RRVR and need to meet. JN had promised to assemble House in emergency, said C S Douglas.

*Morning Call* -- 10 June 1887 Greenway noted that “they had been labouring along pretty harmoniously for about eight weeks, all being in accord with the endeavour that was being made to break down the monopoly which existed….”

JN said this was a question of confidence. Govt dftd motion 14-10

*Morning Call* -- 10 June 1887 – sitting of 9 June -- JN moves that, if feds disallow RRV act, that the work be continued under the Manitoba Railway Act 1881.

E P Leacock has been apptd land commissioner of HBR.

**6th Legislature, 2nd session, 12-26 January and 1 March to18 May 1888 – 40 days.**

The first section of notes is all *Free Press*-based

12 Jan 1888: “the stormiest day there has been for years” but crowds gathered and filled the galleries.

Throne Speech noted the disallowance of many railway acts of previous legislative session. Norquay sat in the second row of the Government benches: “It looked odd to see him, for over fourteen years the leading figure at the opening of the legislature, take a back seat….[He] seemed to feel the fall himself for he looked rather flushed in the face under the inquisitive looks of the hundreds in the gallery who were watching him.” Harrison looked “worried and appeared to be very nervous; and probably felt that after all there was not so much fun in trying to fill Mr Norquay’s shoes…” [LLM 1]

Alex Murray (Assiniboia) resigned to become Municipal Commissioner, Joseph Burke (St FX) resigned, MacArthur was elected in Assiniboia.

“The Session” (anon, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888) reported that the throne speech of 12 January was “unimportant” but that Hon Joseph Burke was defeated in ST FX and on 13 January the government announced its intention to resign.

16 Jan 1888: Harrison govt resigned at 11:00 am on 15 Jan. Greenway at Grand Union Hotel –received request to meet with LG – consented to form govt. House met – much chatter – “Mr. Norquay seemed in high feather. He was in the saddle again; his rival was down in the dark; and not even the immediate prospects of the cold shades of opposition cast a shadow over his joyful feelings.” Formal proceedings of House business, and Harrison formally announced govt’s resignation. Adjournment followed. “After the session was over the Conservatives began singing ‘There’s One More River To Cross’ and headed by their leader, Mr. Norquay, marched out of the chamber and [out of] power to the lively notes of that once popular air.” JN will be Opposition leader when the House reconvenes on Thursday. LLM 2

19 Jan 1888 – members formally changed sides, Norquay was the first to move – “For a few moments all was confusion as the members laden with books, papers, etc. crossed the floor; they indulged in a good deal of chaff at the expense of one another, while the galleries joined in and laughed and applauded.”

Luxton, Brown, Francis, McArthur in front row, then A Martin, Smart, J Martin, Greenway etc – a total of 20

Opposition – 13.

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

House met and adjourned on 19 Jan, and on 20th no business was done, and adjourned to 26 January. On the latter, Norquay carried a resolution asking for an investigation into charges that he colluded with Mann & Holt, contractors for HBR, and received “consideration therefor.” Carried.

Liberal govt did not follow up.

Assembly met on 1 March, adjourned to 15th. Premier said he was going to Ottawa with Attorney General.

Assembly met 12 April. [p 1]

Adjourn shortly after until 1 March 1888.

26 Jan 1888: [LLM 4] A mvmt started in Ottawa aims to remove JN as leader of opposition – “it has been carefully engineered by some of the ‘old guard’ of uncompromising Sir John men, to oust Mr Norquay from the leadership of the party. Mr. LaRiviere is also singled out for destruction.” Their crime is that they haven’t been “as obedient as they should have been to the great mogul in Ottawa. Premier Norquay attended the Quebec conference in opposition to Sir John’s commands; and Mr. LaRiviere informed a caucus of Manitoba Conservatives that Sir John had lied out of a tight corner …”

Scarth, MP for Wpg, and Daly, MP for Selkirk lead the mvmt.:

“two caucuses of prominent Conservatives were held yesterday which were attended by a number of the Conservative MPPs for the purpose of discussing a reorganization of the party with new leaders. A prominent Winnipeg QC seems to be the favourite for the position.” The ‘old guard’ are determined to fire Norquay. “The ex-Premier looked very careworn in the house yesterday, due in all probability to this contemplated act of treachery towards him.”

Norquay tabled a petition for the passing of an act to make him a barrister. Received. Norquay also moved that the Govt set up an investigation into charges alleging that he and his cabinet were in corrupt collusion with Mann & Holt, HB rly contractors – said he wished to vindicate his character. [LLM 4]

1 March 1888 – large attendance, 6 by-elections (Cabinet + 1?), ministers introduced.

Debate on the Reply to Speech from Throne: JN spoke first: It appears to me we are passing through an unprecedented crisis (Laughter and hear, hear)” because no minister from the government that drafted that speech is present (laughter). “That government having passed out of existence” it is the duty of the new govt to state its policy. Greenway then asked for another two-week adjournment while the govt negotiated with the federal government on disallowance. Norquay hoped they would not merely seek a compromise. His own govt had pursued “an independence” that had “got the hearty endorsation of those associated with me at the Inter-provincial Conference. I hope the advocates of Provincial rights who taunted me with insincerity will bear the flag of provincial independence as faithfully as it was borne by the Government of which I was the leader.”

Greenway said they would “not yield an inch” [LLM 5]

11 April 1888 is next sitting in Scrapbook LLM6 “A Short Sitting” FP 12 April 1888

Greenway gave a brief report to the House, beginning with the assurance to the Opposition leader that his mission was “entirely successful (great applause)” and he would give details “in a very few days.” Norquay said he received the news “with cheerfulness. (Applause).” He hoped “the bugbear of monopoly has been effectually disposed of.” He assumed the result was “largely attributable to the action taken by the government of which I had the honour to be leader during last summer.” If he and his colleagues received no credit “I am not going to record any disappointment but trust to future generations to accord credit to that honourable-mindedness with which myself and my colleagues acted in trying to secure immunity from monopoly to the province of Manitoba.”

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

P 1: re sitting 12 April bill to legalize Municipality of Cartier – “to partly reward the treachery of Mr. Gelly.”

FP 16 April 1888 re sitting of 15 April: “Yesterday was a field day in the legislature…. All the heavy guns in both parties were brought into action.”

New member R. P. Roblin moved the address in reply, and described the past year – “as a matter of policy nothing would be read in the history of the country with such intense interest as that part embraced in the first three months of 1888; he said this with a full recollection of the rebellions and disturbances of an unfortunate character that had taken place.” Compared MB wheat growing to Dakota, said it was twice as productive per acre cultivated. And barley “far superior” to any other in North America for malting and brewing purposes. Immigration was a problem: Canadians in US – 1860 – 250,000; 1870: 500,000; 1880: 720,000 and by now probably 1 million. From Europe thousands are going to US – and “The American people estimated the value of every one to the country at $1,000…. It was in our interest to secure them.” The preceding govt dealt with education in a “niggardly miserly” way. The new govt would save $50-60,000/year. It would conduct its affairs on “business principles” unlike its predecessor, no extravagance, a dollar expended should be given a dollar’s worth of value. Etc. Municipal govt dealt with in clear legislation; redistribution as rep by pop, irrespective of class, creed or colour. Support for CPR but also for new lines.

Norquay: he chose RRVR because “he had been convinced by statistics of the charges made by the C.P.R. discriminated against Winnipeg and Manitoba as compared with the rates they allowed to other cities in Ontario and Quebec.” A buggy from Wpg to Calgary was $40 but Hamilton to Calgary $30. “As a Manitoban he had resented the action and this was what gave rise to that policy of hostility to the monopoly inaugurated in 1887.” He was surprised that the new govt seemed to be proposing more expenditures – “It looked like Satan reproving sin. (Laughter)…. “The abrogation of monopoly was due, in his opinion, to the fact that the Dominion Government could no longer resist the importunate demands of this Province for freedom in railways (hear, hear from the Opposition benches) expressed by the Government of which I was the leader.” Due also to the unusually large harvest last year. Norquay wondered about “manhood suffrage”: “he did not consider it necessary in this country where the property qualification could be so easily obtained.”

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888) Norquay speech: his party had struggled to end disallowance and Greenway’s party had “tenaciously opposed” the then government and called him insincere in his efforts – but “no one ever labored with greater earnestness to secure immunity from monopoly than himself and colleagues.” [1]

Greenway gave a combative speech, criticized the JN govt for many sins and in particular for rly and financial failures.

Leacock dissociated himself from Norquay – he “strenuously objected to the abandonment of the RRVR: “It must be built to show Eastern Canada that the House was in earnest… and that it was not started by a lot of shysters as charged by Sir George Stephen…. The views expressed by Mr. Norquay were not his views and they were not the views of many Conservatives. (hear hear).”

Kirchhoffer was applauded by the govt side.

C. P. Brown – leave RRVR for now – the goal had been to force the federal govt to abandon disallowance, and that had been achieved. Work on HBR instead. As for monopoly, “he had reason to know that the Canadian Pacific Railway a year ago came to the conclusion that it would be in its interest to have monopoly wiped out; and it was probably the settled policy of the Government and the C.P.R. to wipe out the monopoly though the terms might not have been decided upon before Mr. Greenway was summoned to Ottawa.”

Martin said he and Greenway had learned when in St. Paul that Norquay had an agreement with Nor Pac Rly to meet it at Pembina by 31 Dec 1887 by rly from Wpg to Pembina. Nor Pac completed its part of the deal. No not just to end monopoly but also to secure benefits of competition. 15 April sitting, “The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

Drewry also repudiated Norquay’s utterances on the RRVR and supported the govt in completing it.

FP 19 April 1888 – Elections Act – manhood suffrage, Norquay and LaRiviere alone oppose it in vote of 26-2. Joe Martin: “A clause provided that Indians or persons with Indian blood receiving annuity or treaty money, should be excluded from voting. He was not in favour of discouraging Indians from becoming civilized and adopting the customs of civilization; but so far as using the franchise was concerned, they should be placed in the same position as aliens. A German had to reside here three years to become naturalized in order to be allowed to vote; and it was thought fair that Indians should be placed in the same position.”

Norquay did not favour manhood suffrage – “they should guard very jealously against extending the franchise to irresponsible parties.”

26 April 1888 – a Robinson amdmt to cut time from 3 years to 1 for Indian leaving reserve to qualify for the vote – dftd 17-11 (JN and the Conservatives in the 11 supporting)

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888) 26 April 1888: Mr. Robinson “spoke eloquently on behalf of the Indian rights, but was outvoted. The Govt followed its “policy of attacking everything ‘Indian’ [and]…actually placed the original owners of the soil on the same footing as foreigners, requiring a three years residence after renouncing treaty before enfranchisement.” Joe Martin also moved to disfranchise many govt employees in specific named positions, who would have been Conservative “for the most part,” according to the *Call*. Norquay moved to strike this clause, but was defeated 10 to 17. This included most federal appointments but not provincial ones. Norquay called this measure “discrimination,” and said: “These are things upon which we want some enlightenment from the gentlemen opposite. I thought the axe, in hewing straight, would have fallen on all alike, but it seems to have swerved a little from the line. Now, sir, if we are to disfranchise the civil servants, I think there should be no discrimination. I hate to see one civil servant enjoying the franchise while othrs are deprived of it. It would be a crowning injustice, and one that I will raise my voice against as long as I can speak on the floor of this House.”

Roblin amended the bill, thereby excluding every civil servant who earned more than $350 per year, including soldiers.

Norquay on the following day defended Icelanders voting and being represented in an amendment defining Gimli constituency to include them. Dftd on straight party vote.

27 April 1888 – Kirchhoffer gives notice of a bill to authorize JN “to practice at the bar in any of Her Majesty’s courts of law or equity for the province of Manitoba.” On 3 May the bill was introduced and given 1st reading.

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

2 May – printing issue – Luxton open letter – Burrows acquired Times and Sun, latter with my assistance, amalgamating them, published an evening paper only, leaving morning slot to FP.

[“Report of the Delegates to Ottawa to discuss the Disallowance Policy and the Abrogation of Monopoly,” Manitoba, Legislative Assembly, “Sessional Papers 1888” – see Norquay-Notes-Gov Docs.

7 May 1888 – Greenway motion that House “Concur in” the resolutions of the Interprovincial conference Oct 1887 Quebec City. The provinces “understood the discrimination under which they laboured on account of the friction existing between the Canadian government and the governments of the provinces….” This was not an irresponsible body. There must be better understanding of some of the clauses defining the powers of the respective legislatures. One in particular – the veto power – disallowance should be done away with, or placed in the hands of another body, perhaps the Supreme Court. The only question should be: is the act ultra vires? And the Senate – had fallen “very far short” of its intended role as a protector of the provinces.

Norquay noted the Throne Speech of 1883 called for an interprovincial conference – had not been followed up because feds met Manitoba on vital questions. Notes 1887 conference argued Imperial govt should exercise disallowance power. And Senate – half of province’s senators should be elected, and for a term of years, not life. And regular revisions to subsidy based on population, with revisions downward when density reduced cost of services. He thought unrestricted reciprocity would cut cost of Canadian-made farm implements by 35%.

Leacock undermined Norquay with an amendment to the Greenway resolution. Roblin attacked Leacock.

Motion carried 19-5. Norquay voted with govt. Against: Leacock, LaRivière, Brown, Drewry, Marion. [Tories]

Manitoba Sessional Papers “Budget Speech 1888: Treasurer Jones’ Speech” and “Mr. Norquay” [as reported by the “Call” pp 19-24] and “The Premier” [as reported by the “Free Press” pp 24-31] and “Mr. LaRivière’s Defence” as reported by the “Call”]

11 May 1888 –budget speech, which noted ‘the deplorable financial state of the province and the wretched manner in which its interests were looked after in the past…” – Jones spoke for 4 hours. Headlines: “Fraud!! Treasurer Jones exposes the dishonesty of his predecessors. Civil servants plunder the province with impunity.” Etc. “reckless and dishonest management” of previous govt.

The govt contended that JN could have got the money for RRVR but chose not to – put delay and obstruction in way.

JN spoke for 1 ½ hours in reply. According to the FP, “he began his speech in a very mournful and apologetic strain. He appeared to feel deeply his desertion by his colleagues, for the seats of Mr. LaRivière and Dr. Harrison, against whom such severe charges had been levelled by Mr. Jones were vacant and Norquay alone represented the offending administration.” Then: “He deplored as much as anyone the transactions with which he had been made acquainted, and certain matters if proved under strict investigation he would be in his position obliged to condemn. (A voice, well I should say so.)… Before dealing with these he would await the arrival of those who should be here tonight to explain on the floor of the House matters which seemed to him inexplicable. (Applause).”

“If once suspicion rested on one, he had for all time to bear the odium of criminality. We were more just even to our criminals than that, for they were held to be innocent until proven guilty. But let the finger of scandal be once pointed at a public man and no exculpation would ever wash him white.”

He defended civil servants and said they should be dealt with fairly rather than fired summarily.

FP notes that “Having got through the apologetics, Mr. Norquay dropped his mournful voice and attitude and became aggressive.”

The Drummond loan failed because Drummond did not carry out his promises. He then gave “a long account of his weary pilgrimage to New York last fall to sell the bonds, but which he was unable to do owing to the stringency of the money market and the opposition of the Canadian Pacific.”

Re HBR and charges of collusion: Sutherland cabled from London in fall, 1886, asking for aid, and it was given. After 27 miles of rly were built, Sutherland wrote that Ryan & Holt were entitled to bonds of $226,000 [sic]. On 24 December half of these bonds were handed over. Before the other half were given over, in Feb 1887, LaRivière went to Ottawa “to see about the land grant, and it was only upon him wiring that it would be handed over by the Dominion government that the balance of the bonds were [sic] given to the contractors.” House adjourned at midnight and JN resumed on Saturday afternoon.

He also engaged in “a fierce onslaught” on the Govt for adopting the system of manhood suffrage and disfranchising civil service, thus throwing the government “largely into the hands of irresponsible persons having no interest in the country.”

McKenzie rose to interrupt JN and say he paid 15 times the taxes of JN – who replied: ‘That may be true, but very few men have come out of so many years of public service as I with so little wealth. What property I have suffices my ambition.’”

The telephone in his house at public expense was put there for public service. And the small matter of a $50 sum – [can’t find the rest of the qtn – cut off badly]

Greenway criticism of JN is severe and several hours long – terrible administration, errors in administering civil servants, Acton Burrows was the worst of those “who fed at the public crib” and defrauding the province. Greenway notes that on 9 Nov 1886 the JN govt approved contract with HBR via o-i-c. This declared work on road was “about completed,” and it rewrote the o-i-c of 4 October, the one that demonstrated that they knew the conditions to be complied with, and that had not yet been completed. All this to win the 1886 election. And they then granted the $256,000. And JN had an interest in this contract. JN objected to Greenway’s comments – Greenway shot back re HBR that “the Government was discussing whether it was not a duty that they owed the people to institute criminal proceedings against Hon. Mr. Norquay and his colleague, Hon. Mr. LaRivière, in this connection. (Sensation).” The HBR handed over a sum to aid the govt in its re-election campaign. On 24 December half the bonds were handed over, in defiance of the law. They asked Thos White for approval on 22 Dec., he advised them to get official approval, but they never got an engineer’s certificate and then handed over the money. Now, the govt would spend $35,000 to enable the rly to pass inspection and thus get the land grant which was the security for the bonds. This was previous govt’s responsibility.

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, perhaps *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888) contains other parts of the Norquay speech: especially that he took salary as minister to the end of the month, an extra $50, but in fact had resigned earlier. He asserted that this was appropriate, only 6 days, “and he thought that after eighteen years’ service he was doing no great sin in taking salary to the end of the month when he resigned.”

Greenway’s “violent attack” included charge that Norquay had benefited personally from the HBR deal, a “nefarious transaction,” and they were considering whether “they will institute criminal proceedings” against Norquay and minister LaRiviere. The Call said this was “reckless slander” and described Martin “poured forth a constant stream of invectives having neither sense nor point, and much to the disgust of the spectators in the gallery.”

“Mr. Norquay then rose and said: I wish just to state to the Hon. leader of the Government in view of the charge he has stated this afternoon… [to] place me under arrest that I am prepared to meet him and to face the court on any question or charge he may prefer against me… I defy him to substantiate those charges.” “This speech was greeted with loud applause by the galleries.” House adjourned.

“The [1888] Budget” booklet on the debate, LLM contains Norquay speech “as reported by ‘The Call’” pp 19-24

Norquay defended civil servants who were being dismissed. He argued the treasurer’s speech was “most partisan and most one-sided. They had been in search of anything wrong in order to make use of it for party purposes.” [19]Any administration long in power will have made mistakes. His own government had fought Ottawa on the basis of “a principle which was denied to us.” The Drummond story: we accepted his offer (based on Morton, Rose & Co support), he then withdrew when Ottawa opposed the RRVR. He told the story of his trip to Chicago, Toronto, and New York – “they found it impossible to negotiate the bonds. … There was a great stringency in the money market… He had letters from Messrs. Wiman, Villard, Oakes and other regretting their inability to help him, and these letters proved how close was the state of the New York money market when he was there….” [20] Since then, affairs have improved and this Greenway govt have been lucky. Re HBR – 40 miles were built, he had been told, so he gave half the bonds to Mann & Holt – half of $256,000, having been assured that the land grant had been placed to the credit of the province.[21] LaRiviere sent telegrams – “This was the authority on which he and his colleagues here acted in passing the order-in-council.” LaRiviere ‘honestly believed” the assurances re transfer of lands. “owing to unfortunate circumstances, work on the road had not proceeded as contemplated.’

Next day: Saturday: re govt’s “disfranchising act” – it took votes from property owners and gave it to irresponsible people – the former “were more interested when taxation or responsibility fell on a community.”

McKenzie said he paid 15 times more taxes than Norquay did.[22] Norquay replied that he had been long in office and his “responsibilities with regard to property are not large, but whatever property I have I may say it is sufficient to satisfy my ambition.[23] My ambition has not been in the direction of accumulating wealth; my ambition has been to try and serve my country faithfully and I believe I have done it to the satisfaction of the people, notwithstanding the assertions of my opponents.” A joke about printing patronage – provoked laughter.

Re govt spending $58 for telephone when he lived at St. Andrews -- 12 miles from the city – “ justified”[23]

City of Wpg offered $400,000 to aid RRVR. Then, when asked for it (in November) the city declined, as Free Press noted on 18 November, rejected Holt contract – but it would have given the province what was needed at a better price

LLM scrapbook:

LaRivière spoke on Saturday evening. Some books were behind, that is true, but records were being kept accurately and he was trying to introduce a simpler system. Drummonds made the best offer on bonds – 102 ½ -- but failed because, they said, of federal govt opposition.

HBR – yes, the Govt handed over the bonds, “whether properly or improperly. But before handing over the second half, he and his colleagues desired to make sure of their security. He went to Ottawa for this purpose. As it was Saturday he went to Montreal, where he met Mr. Mann and the H.B.R. Co.’s solicitor, Mr. Kingsmill. They demanded the balance of the bonds.” LaR refused – “till the land grant should be secured. Monday, with Messrs. Mann and Kingsmill, he went to Ottawa and interviewed Sir John Macdonald, in Mr. Pope’s office. Mr. Schreiber was sent for and asked to report on the state of the work on the H.B. Railway. He stated that a Mr. Forrest had reported not very favourable, but still not unfavourably…. Sir John asked Mr. Schreiber if he could make a favourable report on the road on the basis of Mr. Russell’s statement. He said yes, and was instructed to do so. Sir John then dictated a report to council, to Mr. Pope, who wrote it, and undertook to present it, in his capacity as acting Minister of Railways. I suggested some amendments to this report and my suggestions were adopted. Sir John then assured me that I might look upon the order-in-council as passed and hand over the balance of the bonds to the H.B.R. Subsequently a general conversation took place in the course of which I suggested the sending of a telegram to the member for Provencher who was then a candidate for re-election, promising Federal aid to the St. Boniface and Carillon railway…. He promised and suggested that I should draft the despatch. I did not like to compromise myself, and at my suggestion he wrote the telegram, of which I now hold in my hand the original draft. Some days later I received a telegram from my colleagues showing a certain amount of uneasiness, but at that time all the Ministers had left Ottawa, but as I felt perfectly assured I wired back that all was right. When some time later I returned to Ottawa I was astonished to be told by Sir John that he had not seen me in Ottawa on the occasion I have mentioned, though I have here the written proof that he did. Mr. Schreiber acknowledged having met me, but said Sir John was not present at the interview and Mr. Pope had forgotten all about it.”

Joe Martin followed, suggesting LaRivière cheated on printing contracts for the government and was either a crook or “the most complete idiot in the country.” They sparred over many such charges. Martin says Nursey “seems to have been an especial pet of the late Government.”

Leacock proposed that “the men he had followed for so many years” should be allowed to respond to “the grave charges made this day… the horrible serious accusations made against them.”

Norquay added that he would like to defend himself before “a commission to inquire into the charges made against me in the public press,” not as a bit of bravado, despite Greenway’s declaration, but to disprove the charges. Session ended in late evening.

May 16, 1888 [re 15 May sitting] A. F. Martin alleged that JN, Brown, Hamilton, 3 clergymen, and 150-200 others sailed on the steamer Cheyenne from Wpg to Morris to vote for a bylaw in the local council – about half of them had votes – and prevented 40 or 50 locals from voting, some of the arrivals voted twice or more, “changing their hats and coats to do so,” and the bylaw was passed but would have been defeated. “The Premier must have seen the misdoings.” Then a bill was passed in the House to legalize the bylaw, initialed by EPL [presumably Leacock]. Leacock called for a Royal Commission. Norquay said he was acting as a private citizen and voting to further the benefit of securing railway communication.

Norquay then rose on a question of privilege. He read extracts from Greenway’s speech touching on HBR bonds, Rennie’s trip to England “with a view to Mr. Norquay’s having an interest in Mann & Holt’s contract, the advisability of instituting criminal proceedings against Messrs. Norquay and LaRivière, and the dividing up of $250,000 worth of HBR bonds among boodlers in which the late Government was a partner.” He asked if Greenway had made the remarks and Greenway replied “A portion of them.” Had he been reported correctly? “Not entirely.” Did he admit the substance of the report? “I admit some of it.” JN said the replies should be entered into the House Journals, protested against the charges without proof, and demanded an investigation. Martin and Greenway argued he had no right to do so. Leacock defended JN’s right: “He was no friend of the member for St. Andrews, they had hardly spoken for many months, but he claimed for that gentleman justice and fair play.”

Greenway fulminated: “Was there ever in the annals of Canadian history anything so outrageous, so nefarious, as the actions exposed the other night, the charges of which were still unanswered.” He had received information from “more than one gentleman fully cognizant of the facts.”

Leacock agreed the bonds were handed over “improperly,” but would not accept Greenway’s term “illegally.” Greenway wondered if it was worth the expense of “proving what they knew to be true.”

JN replied instantly “you don’t get out of it that way; that is too cowardly.” “Quite an uproar ensued, members calling out from different parts of the chamber. Mr. Speaker remarked that the member for St. Andrews was using too violent language altogether, and the latter replied that he did not care.” Norquay then asked what part of the charges did Greenway wish to adhere to?

Jones insisted that HBR bonds must have been floated at a higher price than was officially declared and that private gains were made. Norquay then moved a resolution containing a newspaper extract as preamble, his denial of the charges, a note that the Premier had not retracted the charges, and calling for a Royal Commission to report on the allegations.

Robinson defended Norquay, opposed Joe Martin’s suggestion that all the charges against all the former government be investigated at once, and said JN deserved a chance to be tried.

Roblin questioned the transfer of $2500 to a deputy minister by the previous govt. to be used for his private purposes before the new govt came into power. Moreover, he said, JN “would not undertake to relieve himself of responsibility for the acts of Gideon Bourdeau, as they were bosom friends together, their business connections were most intimate.” The House adjourned at 6:00, resumed in evening.

JN again insisted he had a right to defend his “personal honour.” The government’s threat of criminal proceedings “was contemptible in the extreme…. And if I am found to be that black criminal that I am charged then let me go back to the position which the honourable member had accused me of being – an Indian. That was a most contemptible thing to do. He had Indian blood in his veins, and he was not ashamed of it. (Applause). He, too, had Scotch blood in his veins; and he felt that he could meet the Indian or the Scotchman on an equality without being ashamed of either origin. He might, perhaps, have been negligent in discharging his duty; of not having exercised that strict supervision that he should have done, through being engaged in the transaction of his public duties. But the charges against him had gone further; they charged him with being in collusion with railway contractors and when they made that charge they threw the lie back in his teeth.” The Premier should prove his charges or allow him to disprove him, “he would denounce him as a paltroon [sic] and a coward. (Applause).” May 16, 1888 [re 15 May sitting]

Martin said Norquay had had a commission before “and the verdict was for him although the evidence was against him. An extraordinary scene then began. Mr Norquay, who was evidently beside himself with anger, began interrupting Mr. Martin, and being called to order by the Speaker, defied his authority. The Speaker read him a severe lesson….”

C. S. Douglas [250 pounds in weight] seemed to defend Norquay against Acton Burrows’ claims, and to suggest that Burrows and LaRivière were in cahoots in the Lovell printing “steal.”

Kenneth McKenzie spoke in Gaelic and the debate ran on. Norquay said “we can stay here as long as you can” and the other side replied “all right.” Eventually Joe Martin said that the government “had considered the advisability of criminally prosecuting” Norquay and LaRivière but had not said “positively that they would take such proceedings; and as Attorney-General he could say that he had not advised such action, and did not intend to do so.” Martin said that Dr. Harrison had conspired to oust Norquay. And had also done so six years ago, when he offered to bring 6 or 7 supporters of JN over to a govt led by Greenway. Harrison denied it. Winram claimed that Harrison met Greenway and Cyr at the St. Julien hotel in 1882 and made the offer.

Martin made the statement again that “the Government had never come to the conclusion to criminally prosecute Mr. Norquay, and they had decided not to do so.” Norquay then said “I am satisfied with this statement.” This debate adjourned at 3:30 am and the all-night sitting resumed with business on the order paper until 7:30 am.

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

Re 6th Leg, 2nd session, p11, re: Norquay on W. R. Nursey petition praying for an opportunity to appear “at the bar of the House or before a committee…in order that he may vindicate his reputation.” Martin moved that nursey should be dismissed as provincial auditor “on account of the state of affairs shown to exist in connection with the provincial auditing by the statements of the honourable the provincial treasurer…”

“Tuesday 16th was destined to be the field day of the session.”

Norquay “rose to a question of privilege.” He referred to Greenway’s speech of Saturday, in discussing the budget, and HBR bonds, and “Mr. Rennie’s mission to England to negotiate with a view to Mr. Norquay’s having an interest in Mann & Holt’s contract, the advisability of instituting criminal proceedings against Messrs. Norquay and LaRiviere and the dividing up of $250,000 worth of H.B.R. bonds among boodlers in which the late government was a partner. Mr. Norquay asked if the premier had made these remarks.” Greenway replied: “A portion of them.” Norquay asked if the premier “had been correctly reported.” Greenway replied: “Not entirely.” Norquay asked “Does he admit the substance of the report?” Greenway: “I admit some of it.” Norquay then asked that the statements and replies be entered upon the journals of the house. “I emphatically protest against such allegations being made without the party adducing proof to substantiate them.” He denied the charges “most emphatically” and demanded an investigation, with parties “placed under oath to prove what they say.”

Leacock and A. F. Martin intervened, the former arguing that Norquay was having a “criminal charge” placed against him. To say that he ought to be in jail and then not take action to prosecute him was “a political persecution.” He was “no friend of the member for St. Andrews, they had hardly spoken for many months, but he claimed for that gentleman justice and fair play.”

Greenway said he would produce the evidence and let the people decide. The “expense of proving what they knew to be true was a question they might perhaps consider upon second thought.”

Norquay “You don’t get out of it that way; that is too cowardly.” p12

Norquay moved, seconded by Harrison, that the premier’s statement that Norquay had misled the house re the handing over of HBR bonds and sent Rennie to England to negotiate with the company “on condition that Mr. Norquay should have an interest in the contract,” had “not the slightest foundation,” and that Greenway claimed to have documents to prove the charge and that the government was considering “the advisability of instituting criminal proceedings against Messrs. Norquay and LaRiviere in connection with this and other matters” and that the $256,000 “were divided among a party of boodlers of which the late government was a partner” that a royal commission be appointed to investigate the charges made by the premier. p12

“Finally, after an all night debate the question was settled as follows: we leave persons to judge who came out ahead.”

The *Call* reported: Martin said at about 2:30 that the government “had no desire to bring any charges of a criminal nature against Mr. Norquay and if he (Norquay) had inferred such from the premier’s remarks on Saturday he had misunderstood him, and that was all. The government were quite satisfied that the whole matter should drop.”

The *Free Press* reported: Martin said the government stated “that they had considered the advisability of criminally prosecuting Messrs. Norquay and LaRiviere; but they had never said positively that they would take such proceedings; and as attorney-general he could say that he had not advised such action, and did not intend to do so.”

The bill 42 authorizing Norquay to practice at the bar was “voted down as a party question” though the bill provided only for him to pass every exam and to shorten the time to qualify. p13

“At 7:30 in the morning every charge against Mr. Norquay had been exploded.” p14

17 May 1888 FP: “the bill to allow Mr. Norquay to be a lawyer by passing his examinations without taking the usual five years course of study was beaten on the second reading. Hon. Mr. Martin and Mr. Luxton spoke against it basing their opposition on the fact that the law society, which is given practically exclusive jurisdiction over matters of this kind had decided against Mr. Norquay. Mr. Kirchhoffer, Mr. Leacock and Mr. McBeth spoke in support of the measure.”

House resumed at 3:45 pm on 16 May: W. R. Nursey resolution -- to remove him as provincial auditor. He and his two lawyers, H. M. Howell and R. Cassidy “were then admitted by the sergeant-at-arms into the little semi-circular space fenced off with an iron railing just inside the folding doors leading from the hall to the floor of the chamber.” Norquay called for specific charges that Nursey might reply to. Speaker said this was not a trial but that Nursey asked to be heard. Howell spoke for fifty minutes, argued the auditor was above the government and occupied a position similar to that of a judge, did not hold his position “during pleasure,” and that the charges were very vague and included such explanations as “a statement made by the Provincial Treasurer – one wouldn’t hang a dog on this.” Joe Martin noted that Nursey was appointed auditor on 8 March 1879, did not have actual papers of appointment under the act, which was passed later, but a royal commission could investigate the charges that he did not keep the books properly. Norquay objected to the process but eventually relented and the motion passed.

“The Session” (anon pamphlet, *The Call* newspaper, 23pp, nd, ca. 30 May 1888)

Howell called for “an English-speaking people in an English-speaking house with a constitution before them to give his client fair play…British justice.”

Joe Martin then “tried to shuffle out of the position he had taken” – and introduced a new motion to meet Howell’s objections and offer new grounds and a new conclusion – a royal commission to inquire into Nursey’s conduct of the affairs of the auditor’s office. p16

Thursday 17 May: P16 – re firings in civil service

Conclusion of pamphlet text: “Never did a government meet a parliament with so bright a prospect. Never did a government prorogue it with such a disgraceful record.” p19

The government dismissed a number of civil servants and officials on grounds of either cause or economy or both.

Norquay moved a motion regretting that the govt had not recommended a sum “as would be a proper and just recognition of the services of those civil servants and officials who further duties were dispensed with…” Greenway refused on the “strange principle that because some men might have done wrong, innocent men were to be deprived of what the premier acknowledged they were entitled to.” The *Free Press* disagreed with his decision.

Budget debate resumed [**17 May 1888 – FP**] – Leacock said he was satisfied with JN’s explanation respecting the charges made against him in the budget debate.

Hon. Mr. Smart delivered a succinct speech critical of the extravagance and reckless behaviour of the previous govt.

Sessional indemnity of $550.

Luxton said salaries of civil service in the past had been too high, and there were too many civil servants. But this government was cutting salaries when it should not. Norquay defended “fair living wages” for these people: “Faithful servants of the province should not be driven out of the service by the harsh economy of the government.”

May 18, 1888: sitting on CPR proposal to lease the Emerson Branch to Government, and Van Horne’s threat attempting to “bulldoze” the govt. The threat being that CPR would not discuss further railway development in MB if RRVR was pursued. Members spoke on either side of the question but Norquay sided with the Greenway govt – he could not approve “of any attempt to coerce and intimidate the Government of this province….”

May 19, 1888: short sitting – committee on public accounts found some issues with the accounts of the past year, recommended tighter process and an investigation be undertaken. The house then prorogued, the singing as enthusiastic as in former years, but the decorum greater, and there was “a lack of hilarity” following the Lieutenant Governor’s departure, perhaps owing to the sedateness of the new Government, perhaps to the melancholy reflection ‘We shall part to meet no more.’ The waste-paper baskets were spared the old-time flinging at members’ heads; and [the gallery members] were not treated to the customary exhibition of antics.”

July 5: Schultz sworn in on Monday last. Dubuc administered the oath, Justices Killam and Bain witnessed.

July 19, 1888 – provincial election results – 33 govt, 5 opposition – JN won Kildonan by 2 votes, the narrowest margin, over McArthur, plus Marion in St B by 6 votes, Wood in Cypress/Glenboro (against 2 Liberal candidates who split the vote); Gillies in Minnedosa (against 2 Govt supporters); and O’Malley in Lorne/Holland.

August 28 1888 – Legislature opened on Tuesday afternoon. Select committee to inquire into Nursey’s conduct.

*Sun* 28 August 1888 – Lt Gov Schultz “acquitted himself with all the dignity and grace of an ancient courtier.”

Norquay “was applauded upon rising to reply…. Our rights so dearly bought were about to be given away.” The election had not been fair. “There was kidnapping and drugging and steamboats hired to capture voters and keep them from the polls. In fact, some voters did not get back to their homes for three days after the election.” The government policy “seemed to be to take the scalps of a few poor civil servants, and keep the balance trembling in their shoes.” The government had done little on the RRVR or on service in sw MB. He strongly supported the HBR and thought it negligent not to mention it in the throne speech.

August 29 1888: Norquay criticized the new govt’s railway policy on Wednesday night – only the Northern Pacific contract had been submitted to the House – how did one know whether the St P M & M was not better? Was the latter really “the twin brother of the C.P.R.? Show us the various offers – we can best decide which is a better bargain.

*Sun* 29 August 1888: “For talking against time Mr. Norquay takes the cake. He managed to take up about three-quarters of an hour.”

30 August 1888 – contract with NP&M carried by 27-10. Norquay compared the MB struggle for its rights under the constitution to other provinces’ struggle for responsible govt.: “…he claimed that he had done more towards securing the present state of affairs than all the agitation by members on the opposite side, and said that time would demonstrate this. The time was not far distant when it would be known to the public of Manitoba and the Dominion that it was a memorandum sent by himself and colleagues that had brought about the cessation of disallowance through direct instructions from Downing Street that the cause of Manitoba should prevail.

Roblin gave notice that he would likely have to vote against the govt on the rly deal. The RRVR was supposed to be open to all railway corporations. We want the NP, yes, but also the St PM&M, and others.

*Call* 30 August 1888: JN delivered “an able criticism” of the contract. JN speech lamented loss of power over rail track so that other companies could have access – “a free, open avenue for all railroads that so chose to come into the province and compete for its traffic. This struggle from which we had emerged was one which had rarely if ever been equalled in the history of Canada. The older provinces might talk of their struggles for responsible government, of their struggles for the abolition of various privileges of tenure appertaining to certain parties, but here in Manitoba in our struggle for a right we claimed belonged to us under the constitution, we had passed through an ordeal that had not been experienced by any of the other provinces in the Confederation.

Mr. Greenway – Hear, hear.

Mr. Norquay – The Premier may say ‘hear, hear’ nominally, but here in my capacity as a member of this House, I state that I have done more toward securing the present state of affairs than all the agitation that was ever made by my friends opposite.

Mr. Greenway – Hear, hear.

Mr. Norquay – The time will come when it will be demonstrated that the present state of affairs has been arrived at by the action taken by myself and my colleagues, notwithstanding that my hon. friends opposite, with so much gusto, claim all the credit for themselves. Now sir, I say this though I may not be in a position yet to prove it, but the time is not far distant when it will be made known to the public of Manitoba and to the public of the Dominion that it was the memorandum sent by myself and colleagues that brought about the cessation of disallowance…. we will not have to wait long before it will be shown that direct instructions were given from Downing Street that the policy advocated, or the cause urged by Manitoba under responsible rulers, was the one that should prevail, and naturally those who had intervened to obstruct it had to succumb.” And his govt had then acted “with all the vim and energy they were capable of throwing into the enterprise.” [This is a fluent and effective speech, I think] He emphasizes the advantages of letting the StPM&M run on the RRVR. Concluding, he emphasized that the House should not overlook any offer, should treat all parties with courtesy and respect, and consider experienced able applicants. “(prolonged cheering.)”

In the *Call* 30 August 1888, Greenway’s reply was “rambling, without any pretence ot argument, and evidently only intended as a vent to his surplus spleen. At times he fairly boiled with rage or excitement, or both…. His fists came down on the desk with thundering emphasis and casting a sweeping glance over his docile following he literally bellowed forth a reminder that they had been elected to support the government and had better bear that in mind.

Mr. Norquay – ‘That is right, whip them into line.’

Mr. Greenway – ‘I don’t expect to whip you into line, I have most effectually whipped you out of line – Ah!’ As Mr. Norquay sat smiling in his chair and as a quiet snicker went round, the worthy Premier glared at him for a second with a look which indicated feelings very similar to those which must have animated the traditional toad when he gazed at the bull and began to swell. Fortunately the premier cooled off before he got to the bursting stage….” House adjourned at 6:00, resumed at 8:00.

Martin was “Railway Commissioner.” Vote against amendment was 27-10.

Sept 3 1888 FP – “Auditor Nursey” – JN spoke for over an hour in Nursey’s defence, [*Sun* said 2 hours] agreeing with Gillies that, without proper evidence or investigation, the auditor would be expelled from his position and “disgraced in the eyes of the public”. JN said Nursey had acted with “scrupulousness and fidelity” and that the system was defective, not a result of Nursey’s negligence. Nursey was only a clerk in 1884, not the head of the audit, and should not be made responsible for actions of his then superiors. Nursey then was dftd 31-3.

Sept 4 1888 FP – JN notes report of the committee on old settlers’ claims and recommendation that a royal commission be apptd to investigate

October 17 1888 FP – First session’s last day – House met and then prorogued. The business was an answer to a question: the NP&M would build the Morris branch into Souris country for a guarantee of $5000/mile and it would “probably run nearly to the boundary.” It would fit between the two CPR southwestern lines.

2nd session, 7th legislature, 7 November 1888

November 8 1888, FP: Throne speech touches on CPR opposition to the Portage extension of the RRVR crossing their Southwestern branch.

-Session opens, after Lt Gov departure, with Greenway question of privilege:

He and several colleagues had been subjected to “not only adverse criticism but perhaps the most vindictive criticism that had ever fallen to the lot of a public man in the Province of Manitoba.” A certain newspaper [Free Press] had published an article, “A Second Pacific Scandal,” full of “mendacious statements.” He had known that the paper formerly representing Liberal principles “was about to turn upon them and take the side of their enemies.” The charges included the receipt of funds for election purposes and the granting of a railway contract in exchange for a bribe. Calls for a royal commission to investigate. *Sun* said he used the words “”blasphemous villainous, lying slanders’ to refer to the charges and he declared that he had instituted coriminal proceedings against the paper.

Norquay opened the evening session with an interesting defence of the government’s motion, suggesting the motion be widened to consider HBR issues as well. Joe Martin defended the motion – two charges – MB Central got privileges in exchange for money to govt, and govt received momney from the Nor Pacific.

Free Press 12 November 1888: JN question of privilege – govt had pre-empted legislature and gone ahead with the apptmt of Royal Commission to investigate charges against premier and attorney-general – why? “It appeared that the matter had been brought before the House to allow the premier to work off the superfluous bile which he had been gathering during the recess.” He noted that Greenway and Martin had sworn depositions accusing the parties responsible with criminal libel. After his objections were voted down, Norquay introduced eight motions seeking information on various public works, printing, and railway matters.

*Call* Thursday afternoon, 8 November 1888, opening of House “evoked considerable public interest. The galleries were crowded… The interest of those present was based principally upon the expectation of sensational developments in connections with the recent ministerial scandal, and the sequel proved it well founded. The sitting was, perhaps, one of the most remarkable ever held, and although devoted entirely to the elucidation of the alleged wrongs of one individual, presented features which fortunately are not characteristic of the Manitoba legislature.”

Joe Martin has commenced criminal proceedings against *Free Press* and it scandalous “scandal” article and its “blasphemous, villainous and lying slanders.” By “these scoundrels, these boodlers.” What had happened? The FP had been taken over by “the HB railway people” who came to him and said if Greenway did not support them with $4.5 million “’the *Free Press* will kill you.’”

*Sun* 12 November 1888: Joe Martin scoffed at JN’s change of heart – he had been got at by others – “Had he always followed his instincts, instead of listening to the counsels of evil men, he would probably today be occupying the position of first minister of the province. Hon. Mr. Martin made some facetious allusions to the ‘vinegar’ consumed at Elm River. He said the fellow-countrymen of Mr. Norquay drank that gentleman’s whiskey at Elm River, ate his oysters, listened to his comic songs, admired his Red river jigs, and then went quietly and voted for him (Mr. Martin).” Norquay was working merely for Burrows and Luxton – “to carry out the behest of a little gang down town and make capital by asking to have the scope of the commission widened…”

What’s more, said the *Sun*, the letters from Luxton and Burrows and the resolution introduced by JN “had been carefully compared and it was found that they were all run off on the same typewriter, so that it was evident they came from the same source.”

Free Press 13 November 1888: Colcleugh moved the reply – attacked the CPR for receiving $15 million to accept disallowance but spending no money on branch lines in MB. – “an American paper spoke of the CPR as the Dominion Government on wheels.”

Norquay speech – the 15 millions were a guarantee on interest for loan of that amount. The Nor Pac deal was too costly. He “approved of … the cultivation of a national sentiment, while yielding no right that we possess as a province. We should never try to over-ride the rights of the Dominion.”

Greenway’s response was to take issue with each of Norquay’s points – previous govt failures – too great sympathy with Dominion, errors on admin of public lands, school lands, etc.

Free Press 16 November 1888: issue of crossing CPR rly lines: JN says the govt was not negotiating appropriately and brought the crisis on themselves – “the provincial treasurer was found marching up one Saturday with his military boots on and invading the private car of Supt. Whyte.” No wonder the CPR stood on its legal rights. His govt had dealt fairly with the CPR – in 1883 he did what other provinces had done by guaranteeing the CPR would not be subject to “excessive taxation.” In 1885 he passed the rly aid act that enabled extension of branches to Boissevain and Holland. No assistance was given for the further extensions to Deloraine and Glenboro so there was a “moral obligation that had to be fulfilled.” They should not resort to retaliatory legislation. The rly crossing would be built, whatever the courts ruled “because the will of the people is supreme; but we have to adopt other constitutional means.”

*Call* 13 November 1888: adds detail from JN speech: “the Railway Commissioner and his colleagues went out, backed up by two or three hundred special constables, and had to run away from the dead engines and ded. pots. [sic], and several who had been unable to crowd themselves into the cars had to find their way back through the mud and slush.”

He also lamented the plan to slash the salaries of Education Supt and Supt of Normal Schools.

He also commented on Mr. Jerome’s speech – which had been delivered in French – and not reported on except by a one line note in the Call newspaper – so JN continues to show evidence of competence in French. The subject was “the development of a national sentiment. If there was to be set up against the Federal rights, rights which were only problematical or speculative in their nature, without being duly defined by the constitution such a sentiment could not be developed. They should remember in their dealings with the federal government that while they urged the rights of the province they should never attempt to over-ride the rights of the Dominion. He thoroughly believed in the maintenance of a strong central authority and that in the due conservation of the rights and privileges of both the central and local governments lay the strength of the Dominion. He hoped that whatever position the province might find herself, all due regard would be paid by those entrusted with her welfare not to encroach upon the rights of the central power. While members of the provincial legislature they should also remember that they were citizens of the Dominion.”

Greenway twitted JN as usual – “he was sorry to see Mr. Norquay so strenuously advocating the prerogative of the federal authority. To the subversion of the provincial rights.” Talk of an arrangement between CPR and NorPac was “an absurd contention.”

*Call* 16 November 1888: JN “delivers an eloquent speech” on the crossing issue – both sides could be criticized – the clause in the resolution suggesting measures to indemnify the province for losses caused by obstruction “looked as if something were intended like the moral conveyed by the old fable of the wolf and the lamb – as if the government would imply that then intended to get at the CPR somehow or other it didn’t much matter how.” Negotiation would have preempted this friction. “’Instead of that, however, they found the provincial treasurer marching up one Saturday in his military boots and invading the private car of Superintendent Whyte. Perhaps he got offered a drink.’ (Laughter). Mr Jones – ‘Do you blame me if I did? Mr. Norquay – ‘I would not blame you for taking it if you got it. Pursuing such a policy as this it was no wonder they had provoked the CPR to stand upon their legal rights.’ Mr. Greenway – ‘Who was there first?’ Mr. Norquay – ‘I don’t know, all that I have heard is that the only thing there before the mayor was the engine.’

Norquay reminded members that though they liked to criticize the CPR, “that railway was a matter of very great importance to the people of Canada.” He criticized the discrimination in rate setting which, “more than anything else…had induced him to take the stand he did on behalf of the province. He had recognized the bargain that had been made, it had been made in good faith, and he believed at that time was considered to be in the best interests of the whole Dominion. … that bargain was calculated to afford to Eastern Canada the very thing we lacked in Manitoba namely competition, it foisted upon us at the time a monopoly. This was a state of affairs for which the people of this country were not responsible, and they availed themselves of constitutional means to obtain relief. He had believed in passing the RRVR act we were within the constitution. The government which succeeded him believed the same thing, and all the people of this country were of the same opinion.” But they should not now turn to retaliation or retaliatory legislation.

Free Press 17 November 1888: House sat on Saturday morning, then adjourned until January.

*Sun* 31 January 1889 (Thursday is date of report, not of newspaper): “it has seemed like a very one-sided House. A portion of the time Hon. John Norquay, leader of the opposition, was absent, and when he is present he apparently has little fault to find.”

Then the bill to permit rlys to cross another line’s track: JN said the Crown’s legal officer could have obviated this exceptional measure. Martin objected to his “continual misrepresentation” and supposed that they had been prepared by someone else. “Mr. Norquay did not see the necessity of the attorney-general getting into a white heat over the matter.” JN then suggested that the govt men at the Fort Whyte stand-off had taken, if not axe-handles, then “a lot of revolvers. We will find that in the accounts next year.… got from a pet of the government’s, Mr. Ashdown.” The two men then sparred over how each administration had managed to keep the books. Greenway suggested that Norquay now had two newspapers in his cause, The Call and The FP. They then each accused the other of not knowing what he was talking about.

Free Press 1 February 1889: Royal Commission Justice A. C. Killam report was delivered during 31 Jan sitting. Re charges in Call and Free Press newspapers. Biggs represented newspapers, along with Munson (Call) and Wade (FP). Ewart and Howell for Greenway, Martin for himself. Killam noted the difference between the request for investigation by the legislature and the newspapers’ insistence on having the precise wording of their statements. He could not resolve this difference except with enormous investigation that he could not undertake alone so he must conclude that “no evidence in proof of the charges mentioned in the said commission, or any of them, has been obtained… and the said charges have not, nor any of them, been proven.” 15 November 1888.

Free Press 2 February 1889: revenue for year ending 30 June 1888: $1.74 million. Of which $426000 from subsidy, and 988000 from sale of debenture. Spent $418,000 on RRVR, $84000 on education, and $98000 on other rlys: MNW – 40; MSW – 45; HBR – 13.

Free Press 5 February 1889: bill to provide for the crossing of one rly by another. JN welcomed the ruling by the Supreme Court that the province had the right to build rlys within its boundaries. This was better than “the display of axe handles and the like” that had accompanied an earlier adventure. He later introduced motions for returns of govt documents on 7 matters associated with rly business. He still leads the opposition, it’s clear.

Free Press 6 February 1889: Norquay had tabled 23 questions on the same subjects in November 1888. Martin replied very briefly to each and concluded: “I am perfectly satisfied that some busybody who thought he knew a great deal got the hon. gentleman to ask these questions.” [*Sun*’s report on 2 Feb sitting quotes Martin as saying:” he was thoroughly satisfied in his own mind that some busy body got Mr. Norquay to ask these questions, and believed that the hon. gentleman had been stuffed. Mr. Norquay rose indignantly and said he was not the kind of a man who could be stuffed.”]

Norquay replied that “he was not the kind of person that could be stuffed by anybody.”

Free Press 7 February 1889: Several more motions from JN re cost of noxious weeds on federal lands, and rly aid from municipalities.

*Sun* Thursday ca. 8? Feb 1889: A F. Martin who had been absent from MB for about a year complained about the failure of govt to print sessional journals of last August in French. Some people in the province did not understand English.

Free Press 8 February 1889: JN moved that Sifton of North Brandon explain his remark in a Glenboro banquet speech (quoted in FP editorial 7 Feb), that the St PM&M road’s proposal to secure a lease on the RRVR, which he JN believed was “a genuine, real live offer that …would have left the country in a much better position than the one acted upon by the government,” was “a bogus offer.” Sparring followed without much light being case.

Norquay’s home address during the session would be 18 Hallett St. He is member for Kildonan.

Free Press 9 February 1889: what was the maximum rate agreed upon between govt and NPRly for freight from MB to Duluth or another outside point? Martin said they had a verbal agreement and had given their word not to reveal it. JN said this was proof that the deal was simply that NP would not exceed CPR rates.

*Sun* Tuesday ca. 19-20? Feb 1889: JN on bill to ratify NPRly deal: the govt was “so narrow-minded that they must exclude from the road they controlled the rights of certain parties to secure privileges over that road. This feature had never been sanctioned by the people of the province; if he should live until the dissolution of the House, as he hoped to do, he would make it a direct issue in the next election.” The *Sun* ended: “concluding what was admitted to be an able speech, Mr. Norquay moved….” an amendment.

[combine the above with qtn below and cite both papers:]

Free Press 20 February 1889: JN on bill to ratify NPRly deal – Norquay said the bill lacked an essential feature, “that of freedom in railways.” This was the problem of CPR monopoly clause. Even that had a justification, given the empty lands through which it would pass and the 20-year length of that arrangement. But once its implications were clear, everyone in the province opposed the clause: “The cry then went up from Grit and Tory, Conservative and Liberal, that they must have free trade in railways; this was the potent cry that was used on the hustings and assisted to place the present government in the position they occupied. The principle of securing competition in railways could not be claimed by one particular party in this province. Liberals and Conservatives vied with each other in trying to impress upon the people the sincerity of their attempts to secure railway competition.” When govt acted in 1887, “they kept that object before them, that there should be freedom for all railways that chose to run.” This was a principle “universally recognized” in the province, “that if they had railway competition it should be of the fullest and freest nature possible.” The road they controlled in this province should be open to competitors. The approach taken by this new govt “had never been sanctioned by the people of the province; if he should live until the dissolution of the House, as he hoped to do, he would make it a direct issue in the next election…. If the question were made a direct issue at the polls, the country would be justified in repudiating the engagement, and would necessitate another visit from His Highness President Oakes, for the purpose of quelling the agitation again.”

“Hon Mr. Martin: That’s a fine principle, repudiating a contract.”

“Mr. Norquay: The agreement must have the sanction of the people before it can be considered confirmed…..” The govt’s new principle was “Monopoly Preferred” instead of “Free trade in railways.” He was “prepared to bide the time when he should appeal to the people of the country, and expose the fallacious contentions those gentlemen made.” At least the CPR contract ended the monopoly in 20 years. “he believed that if the CPR Co had exercised its power discreetly and had not adopted discriminating rates towards the principal trade centres in Manitoba there would not have been raised such a hue and cry against them, which culminated in the agitation that brought about the extinction of monopoly.” This new contract has no end point. This new contract has no limit. The rates were the same for NPRly and CPRly – [Greenway interjected that NPR was 3 cents/100 lower.] The govt should have kept the RRVR and let any company wishing to do so run on it, “paying only rates of a nominal character.”

Clifford Sifton spoke in reply to JN – in a seat “Almost alongside that of the ex-Premier” “speaking with great fluency, his hands in his pockets, and looking Speaker Winram square in the face….” “He was loudly applauded on resuming his seat.” *Sun* Tuesday ca. 19-20? Feb 1889: Isaac of So Wpg gave an excellent “old-time” speech “putting things in a clear light” and Mr. Wood, the genial member for Cypress, certainly improves on acquaintance, and yesterday afternoon he made quite an interesting and well thought out speech….” in which he opposed JN’s position and thus his own party.

Free Press 21 February 1889: Jones refuted JN by citing the Holt contract of 10 October 1887.

*Sun* Tuesday ca.20? Feb 1889: Greenway replied, focusing on JN in particular” “Premier Greenway badgered Mr. Norquay on his remarks in the afternoon, … now with the index finger of the right hand, and again…. he took up point after point, looking behind and in front at his large following with an air of exultation. He disposed on the contention…. in remarking on the small following of Mr. Norquay in his attitude on this great question, was interrupted by [his cabinet colleague], who said: ‘Only a pair.’ Mr. Norquay: We have quite enough for a division.’ Premier Greenway: ‘We will assist you.’”

Later the JN amdmt was dftd by 29-3 (JN, Gillies, Marion)

Free Press 26 February 1889: Budget speech by Jones, JN replied – asked first about the $35,000 in last year’s estimates aimed at putting 40 miles of HBR in proper condition in order to secure the land grant. He raised his Emerson speech when he had said the HBR was “not then necessary.” Greenway and supporters had howled that it was indeed “sadly needed to develop the country.” On swamp lands, he noted that govt was being offered $2.50/acre for “a large quantity of this land.”

“In reference to the $50,000 loan obtained from the Seminary de St. Sulpice, Mr. Norquay said it was the best arrangement that could have been made at the time, in the face of the opposition shown by the Dominion government and CPR to the government’s railway policy. He was not ashamed of the arrangement….” The loan Jones got was made after the opposition of these people had stopped. And the government’s contract with NPR “sullied their whole political life.” They could have three competing lines running on those tracks.

Greenway claimed to have saved $108,000 in just the first year of their new govt.

Salary: Colcleugh said attendants at asylum shd receive $40/month.

Free Press 1 March 1889: Norquay motion re charge in FP that govt received bribe of $12,500 (for its election fund) in return for certain legislation. Dftd 29-7, JN, Fisher, Roblin, Gillies, Wood, O’Malley, and Marion.

Free Press 1 March 1889: Royal Commission resolutions – “a lively debate” anticipated, “galleries well filled with both ladies and gentlemen who attended to enjoy the fun. They were disappointed, however, the proceedings being very free from acrimony or anything that might cause a sensation, still they evinced a deep interest in the discussion of the question.”

Free Press 2 March 1889: Smart alleged that drainage was used by JN govt to reward its friends with contracts and rapid jumps in land value. The proper principle was that the increased value should pay for the act of drainage. A lot of the drained land was held by speculators. Norquay replied that they drained lands “where the necessity was most urgent.” Their principle was “to do the greatest amount of good with the least possible expenditure.” Drains improved roads and communication and to prevent floods. The previous govt’s works “cost more than they perhaps now would under active competition; but he did not believe, taking all things into consideration, that the cost was excessive.” A key difference now was that he had worked so hard to win increased transfers of money which could now be spent.

Free Press 4 March 1889: re HBR resolution of 1886 granting aid via guarantee on interest on bonds up to $4.5 million. New resolution today saying this sum is too great a liability for the province, and a cash bonus is preferable, up to $2000/mile within the province up to 300 miles. Greenway noted 1884 interest – bonus of $1 million. In 1886 JN had thrown cold water on the scheme. Why northward? Because disallowance cut off south route, said JN and colleagues. In 1886 House passed a guarantee of $4.5 million – this is now seen to be too large. “changed circumstances” and monopoly had ceased. People now looked in other directions.

Norquay: “In considering the history of the HB route for the last 200 years, taking into consideration the difficulties to be overcome, and the miserable material with which this had to be done, he could not but arrive at the conclusion that the difficulties were not of such an insurmountable nature as some people would make us believe. As far as the capability of the Hudson Bay and straits was concerned, he believed the people of this country were united in the opinion that it is perfectly practicable. When we consider the conformation of the continent we cannot but come to the conclusion that there will be a road built to Hudson Bay. There is a vast interest that will be concentrated upon that object but it is more of the Dominion than of this province.” Under his administration, 40 miles were constructed and the line “was for a time in a position to be operated. At the time the request was made for the handing over of the lands in lieu of the bonds given by the province, as the correspondence produced in the House went to show, at least four members of the government were innocent parties in handing over the bonds; and he believed the fifth member was misled by promises made to him. Their action was very severely criticized; it was the result of placing too much dependence upon human promises.” They voted $35,000 last year to secure the lands and the bonds for $256,000 and that the 40 miles would be put in running order. Yet now the govt says there is no need for the HBR. The premier gave Sutherland a letter to show the world saying that MB placed a high premium on the HBR and had guaranteed the interest on $4.5 million – a letter which he now says he regrets. And he wants to back down. “In the eyes of business men it would amount to repudiation, and it would materially depreciate the standing of the province in the eyes of the world.”

They had an obligation to meet. Monopoly was said to be over but is it entirely removed? What if the NP and CPR chose “to enter into arrangements by which competition would practically not exist. The government should have kept the RRVR within their own hands….” Or kept it open to other competing railway companies.

“The matter is still as great a necessity as ever to the people that they should have an outlet to Hudson Bay.”

Roblin was surprised that JN had changed his mind – he was “treating the matter with a want of sincerity and honesty.” He, Roblin, believed HBR was essential, and disallowance/monopoly did not change that necessity.

Near the end of the debate, “a large quantity of plaster fell from the roof to the gallery; no one fortunately, was hurt though some were scared, and it had the effect at the time of clearing the Speaker’s gallery.”

***1890 Hansard***

Throne Speech – *Tribune*: 30 January 1890: “all was bustle and excitement” at the opening of the 2nd session, 7th legislature. The Throne Speech mentions visit of GG, progress in rly construction, negotiations with Ottawa re control of public lands and school lands, and aid to HBR. Provision for founding of Farmers Institutes. Article mentions great public interest in “the school question” and “the use of the French as an official language.”

*Free Press*: 4 February 1890: Thomson moved the repy, mentioned “the sadness with which the members of the Legislature viewed his vacant chair.”

Mr. Harrower, in seconding, said “he had known him since 1874; had supported him for many years, and held his good qualities in high respect.”

*Free Press:* 5 February 1890: Greenway: “to express his very great regret at the death of his old friend, Hon. J. Norquay, with whom he had been associated for many years. He referred to his generous and noble disposition, and said his place could not be filled. He only hoped that his mantle might fall upon the shoulders of one worthy to be his successor.”

1. F. Martin – “his death was a public loss. Many loved him, and all respected him.”