

tration to read these letters in order that they may not be lost to posterity. They are as follows:—and they are not anonymous, Mr. Speaker:—

“Ottawa, Jan. 13, 1896.

“Dear Sir Adolphe Caron.—Although I have already in my place in Parliament denied any complicity whatever in the matter of these anonymous letters, I wish to repeat in this personal manner my emphatic denial of having been in any way connected with their authorship. I wish at the same time to say that I entirely acquit you from the suspicion of having been the cause of communications to the press in regard to this matter.

“I remain, yours faithfully,  
“W. H. MONTAGUE.”

The reply is worthy of the preceding:

“Dear Dr. Montague.—In reply to your letter I fully accept your repudiation of the anonymous letters, as, indeed, I have already stated in Parliament, and I regret the annoyance to which you have been subject in the publication of an allusion to the matter in the press. I wish to add that I am glad that you exonerate me from the suspicion of having been the source of any communication to the newspapers upon the subject.

“Yours truly,  
“ADOLPHE CARON.”

Now, Sir, I think our fair friends, the hon. Postmaster General's fair friends, looking at all the surrounding circumstances, will agree with me in designating these letters as sweetly pretty. Here is the point, Sir, and the reason why I have introduced them; they illustrate in a most remarkable way the value of the ruling which I have been endeavouring to comply with, and the duty of all public men to believe as true all statements made in Parliament. Just think of it, Mr. Speaker. But for that excellent rule—I put it to the hon. Postmaster General—how could he and Dr. Montague have fallen on each other's necks and wept and gushed over each other as they have done just now? Verily, Mr. Speaker, wisdom is justified of her children, and so are your rulings. Now, Sir, I think that in many ways the explanation we have just heard, and in fact the whole performance from start to finish, forms a most fitting climax to the history of this present Parliament. This Parliament, Sir, is likely for many reasons to occupy a perfectly unique position in Canadian history. It has done several things which no Parliament ever did before, and which, if I may venture a prediction, no Parliament will ever do again. In the first place, Sir, this is a Parliament which is on the high road to get six years' indemnities for five years' work. In the next place, it is exceedingly likely to be the only Parliament in Canada to expire by effluxion of time. In the third place, it is the only Parliament I have ever heard, known or read of in any English-speaking community which deliberately re-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

refused to investigate a charge against a Minister of the Crown preferred by a member in his place; and it is most assuredly the only Parliament that has ever sat in any community I have ever heard of in which, when a Minister of the Crown has been accused of high crimes and misdemeanours, that Minister has been allowed to choose his own judges and draw up the charges to suit himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I am in perfect order. I am stating what is on record; I am stating what was drawn up and made the basis of a royal commission issued, the more shame to them, in the name of Her Majesty, by these gentlemen, for the purpose of giving effect to the identical thing to which I have alluded. Well, Sir, all I can say is that the parliamentary majority that would sanction such proceedings is a most fitting complement to the Cabinet we now see before us. The Parliament are worthy of the Cabinet; the Cabinet are worthy of the Parliament. Sir, I did think on Tuesday week that we had reached the lowest depth of degradation to which it was possible for a Canadian Parliament to sink; but I see that I was wrong. To-day's proceedings have convinced me that even in the lowest depths a lower deep can yet be found. I think it was Oliver Wendell Holmes, or some other gentleman equally eminent in psychology, who declared that the real way to get at the truth as to any man or thing was to apply the rule of triangulation to such person or thing. Sir, I propose to apply that rule to the Cabinet. I know pretty well what is the opinion of them held by the Liberal party, and I can form a pretty shrewd guess what is the opinion entertained of them by every true Conservative. But it is interesting to see these things in profile, and it is my happy privilege to be able to afford a side light as to how they strike our neighbours, the citizens of the great American Republic.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was that remark made by an hon. gentleman who, if not a naturalized citizen, is a large property holder in some portions of the great American Republic? As it happened very recently, four of these hon. gentlemen were travelling either in the United States or in the immediate vicinity of the United States. They were, as I am informed, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways. On this particular occasion, Sir, they were not screened from the vulgar gaze within the sacred precincts of the car “Jamaica;” but they were travelling in an ordinary Pullman car like com-