

did it he would not be worthy to be leader and I would be against him. That is plain English, is it not? I challenge the statement of the leader of the Government here that Sir Wilfrid Laurier ever made any such statement to Mr. Borden.

The CHAIRMAN—I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this fact, that the hon. gentleman has no right to challenge a statement made by the hon. leader of the Government in this House without being in a position to prove that the hon. gentleman is in error. Unless he is able to give that evidence, he has no right to impute error.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—That is a peculiar position for a chairman to take. I am here making a statement on my own responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN—You have no right to do that.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—The chairman has no right to ask me for proof more than what I say, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has never made any such concession, and if the chairman is not satisfied with the statement let him go and ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It is not for me to bring Sir Wilfrid Laurier here, but I make the statement.

The CHAIRMAN—I maintain my decision that the hon. gentleman has no right to make such statement; he has no right to oppose the statement made by the hon. leader of the Government without being in a position to prove that that statement is incorrect.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Will His Honour the chairman allow me—

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I have a word to say to that; the leader of the Government had no right to make the statement he did. Why did you not call him to order?

The CHAIRMAN—That is another question.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—When he said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier made concessions to Mr. Borden that this Bill was to go into immediate effect, giving increased senatorial representation without the concurrence of the House, the leader of the Government did not give us any proof of that statement.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY—He did not have to.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—And why should I have to when I challenge his statement?

Is it to be flesh for one and fish for another? Why did the chairman not call the leader of the Government to order? I feel that this is an affront to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the leader of the Government to make such a declaration before the country. Why did not the chairman challenge his statement and call him to order?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—He did not say so.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Yes, he did say so.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I did not so understand him.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—The chairman loses sight of the fact that the statement made by the leader of the Government is not a matter of personal knowledge. I suppose he intended to convey that he had information from somebody that such a thing had been stated. If the hon. leader was ready to say that he was a witness to an agreement of that kind, it would be different.

The CHAIRMAN—The only question was that the hon. leader of the Government stated something, and I do not believe that the hon. member for Victoria division (Hon. Mr. Cloran), had a right to say that he was not correct, without being in a position to give evidence that he was wrong. That was my contention.

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I would like the hon. leader of the House to remember that in some circumstances in the Senate his arguments have been so strong and he has made his case so well, that I was induced to go with him. When he does not make a strong case it is because the case is not strong, for when he has a good case he makes a very strong argument which has often convinced me that I should vote with the Government. I appeal to his logical judgment, because his judgment is very logical, and ask him if it is not illogical to contend that the representation of the provinces in the Senate should take place before the representation in the House of Commons is made. The representation in this Senate is the necessary consequence of the representation in the House of Commons. I would submit to the hon. leader of the House this proposition: if provinces had no representation in the House of Commons, would the hon. leader contend that those provinces could be represented in the Senate? Why is this Bill brought before the Parliament? Because there is a new registration as the basis of representation; because in virtue of the last census certain