

Mr. ELLIS. May I make this observation? Those of us who live five hundred miles from here, and remain on Thursday, have to travel half the day of Good Friday in order to get home.

The PRIME MINISTER. The intention of the Government is as I have announced. We have no particular wish in the matter, and we are in the hands of the House, so far as that is concerned. If the general wish of the House were to the contrary, that the House should adjourn from Wednesday to Tuesday, we have no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. I have been asked, as one of the whips of the party, what the intention of the Government is on the matter brought up by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis). I wish the First Minister could say now, that we might go home on Wednesday night so as not to do violence to our conscientious scruples by travelling on Good Friday. It should be remembered that Holy Thursday is also a holiday.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GIBSON. I am not speaking now as a Presbyterian, but as the whip of the Liberal party. I would like the First Minister to decide this question now. If the House should adjourn from Wednesday night until the following Tuesday, it will, I believe, meet with the approbation of gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GIBSON. Except, perhaps, those who live in Ottawa.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the tenderness of the conscience of my hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) is shared generally by the members of the House, the Government will have to yield to that, and adjourn on Wednesday instead of Thursday.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McINNES. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a few remarks on a question of privilege. It appears that the remarks which I made last Monday in support of a motion asking for the disallowance of a British Columbia statute, have not pleased the Toronto "Globe." On the contrary, that paper has taken exception, and violent exception, to some of my statements. The portion of my speech which they object to is as follows:—

Take the attitude of the "Globe" in this matter. Why, Sir, from judging its past, you would have supposed that it would have stood up firmly for the people, in favour of securing to the great masses of the people their rights, that the attitude upon this question of the men who control it, would have had a clear and certain ring of "neverism" about it. What is the fact? I have no hesitation in saying that from the time, some months ago, when they took up this matter with extraordinary, sudden and intense interest, their attitude has been characterized by cant and de-

ception. Sir, they have been beating about the bush for month after month, suggesting what they dare not openly state. They have dealt in a profusion of arguments that have been ingenious at times, but invariably unprincipled. Now, after all these months of pretended discussion and unfair statement of facts with regard to this matter, they finally pretend to come to the conclusion and that conclusion is definite only in this that the Canadian Pacific Railway, their masters, should build that line.

They have seen fit, on account of my using that language, to write editorially in the "Globe" of April 6th, as follows:—

Let him carry his rhetoric to Victoria if he wants to manage the local affairs of his province. And let him abuse the "Globe" to his heart's content. He has perhaps the right to lie and slander under the protection of the privileges of Parliament, and we cordially agree that he is an expert at the business.

In the issue of the same paper of yesterday it concludes an article in the following language:—

If the "Globe" made an attack upon Mr. McInnes, it was in reply to a scandalous charge against this paper made deliberately on the floor of Parliament, a charge that we brand as a falsehood, and its author as a liar and a slanderer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that, in the first instance, when this matter was brought to my attention, I had not the slightest idea of bringing it before the House, but after the "Globe" has reiterated the statement, and after it has repeated the insult, I feel that were I to allow it to pass by with that contempt which I would like to give it, my silence might be construed into an acknowledgment, that possibly I did make statements which were either untrue or unwarranted. I have nothing whatever to detract from what I stated last Monday. What I said, I believe, was true. I believe that I was altogether warranted in making the statement which I did, by circumstances which are within my knowledge, and within the knowledge of most hon. gentlemen present.

And, Sir, I can say that I am more inclined to believe in the absolute truth of every statement I made, on account of the extraordinary exhibition which the "Globe" has made of itself in regard to this matter, and the bald denials it has given without a scintilla of argument in refutation of what I stated. I felt that I had a duty to perform in connection with this British Columbia question. The matters which I brought forward, and the statements which I made in support of my motion, were not made either to please or displease the "Globe." I did not bring the matter forward, or speak as I did to either please or displease the Canadian Pacific Railway or any person else. I conceived that I had a duty to perform towards my province, and that it was my duty to ventilate a condition of affairs which certainly, in my opinion, demanded prompt and firm action on the