

from East Simcoe said a moment ago that the candidates were two Tories. To some extent it is true; but there are Tories and Tories. On the one side there was Mr. Dobell, whose record I am sure is above suspicion; and on the other side there was our old friend Mr. McGreevy, who is well known in this House. I will quote to the hon. gentleman what was the programme of Mr. Dobell. He said:

And if you send me to Parliament as your representative I shall not allow party spirit to warp my judgment, and shall record my vote upon all questions as in my belief the best interests of the country demand. * * * I shall use my best endeavours, if elected, to have measures carried which will benefit the Dominion, increase its foreign trade,—

What a departure from sound principles is that.

—remove obstacles to closer and freer trade with our sister colonies and the mother country, and I shall not cease to advocate reciprocal trade, on fair and just terms with our great neighbour, the United States.

I do not observe much cheering on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to that programme. Now, let me take the comments of the ministerial organ in the city of Quebec upon this paragraph of Mr. Dobell's address:

Mr. Dobell's platform embraces reciprocity with the United States, freer intercolonial trade, and closer foreign trade relations, superinduced by more liberal terms than we now possess. Of course, this is a programme, to which Mr. Laurier could interpose no objection, since he has opinions of a similar nature himself.

Give me such Tories every day, and have them elected everywhere.

Mr. McGreevy, we take it, has not lost faith in the National Policy, which he helped to create.

Well, Sir, it is a matter of record that the Liberal party unanimously supported the candidature of Mr. Dobell. It is equally a matter of record that the Conservative party from the leaders down supported the candidature of Mr. McGreevy, and I suppose at this time Mr. McGreevy's health is sufficiently restored to have allowed him to take his place among the Conservative members of this House. But, Sir, the Government decided in favour of holding a session. They were wise. But it was an effort to make such a decision. Why, it was such an effort that it almost broke the Government. We have it on good authority, we are not in the secrets of the gods, but we know one of the gods, and not the least among them, the one whom I take to be the god of war, would no longer soar on the Olympian heights, but that he declared his determination to come down to the level of frail, ordinary, mortal flesh. For three days the whole ministerial world was on the tiptoe of anxious expectation. "Will he return or will he remain out?" That was

Mr. LAURIER.

the anxious question which every ministerialist harboured in his breast. But as good fate would have it, peace was restored. The wandering one returned to the fold, and ever since there has been, at all events, peace on the outside, and the Government seems to me to be very much like one of those sulphur springs whose waters are calm and quiet on the surface, but whose muddy bottom is always boiling with mephitic gases. But, Sir, I see my hon. friend the Minister of Justice shaking his head at the statement which I have made. I make that statement upon authority. I make it upon the authority of the Conservative press. I know that my hon. friend said a few days afterwards that the story was not true, and that there was no dependence to be placed upon the ministerial press. I always thought so myself. That was no news to me. But I thought that so much smoke could not exist without some fire, and that the exception in this instance simply confirmed the general rule. But, Sir, there is more than this. We are all proud of our British institutions. My hon. friend to my right, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), speaking some seven or eight weeks ago in the western part of the province of Ontario, made an elaborate comparison between the American constitution and the British constitution, and he concluded, and rightly concluded, that the British constitution is more elastic and more responsive to the voice and to the wish of the people than is the American constitution. There are, under the American constitution, several powers which are fixed by law, while the same powers here, are left for their exercise to the intuitive action of the Executive. Thus, under the American constitution, the summoning of Congress does not exist, and Congress meets according to the very letter of the instrument itself. It is fixed by the constitution, whereas, under the British constitution the only provision that exists is that there should be a session at least once a year. But as to the time Parliament shall meet, the entire discretion is left to the Executive, and it is a discretion which should not be exercised except for cause adequate and in extreme cases. In England, though the period at which Parliament is to be summoned is left to the Executive, the day on which Parliament will open is as well known to every voter in Great Britain as if it were fixed by law, and a Government would not be permitted either to postpone or advance the period at which Parliament meets unless there was strong cause adequate to show for it. If in England a Government presumed to violate the unwritten law of Parliament in that respect, that Government would be at once called to severe account by friends and foes. But in this country, although we have a similar law, that law is violated without the slightest concern by the Ministers of the day, as if the only