

and returned about the end of April, and in May he went out to Vancouver and he issued a report in regard to opium conditions on the Pacific coast. Any person who reads that report will be still more astonished that the man who was so conversant as the hon. gentleman is with the terrible evils of that traffic could speak slightly of any steps being taken to control, restrict, or put an end to that evil.

I might just incidentally call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman who was Deputy Minister of Labour and who was slated for Minister of Labour, was away all the session of 1909. Yes, this same gentleman was not in the House at all; his constituency was not represented on the floor of Parliament during all the session of 1909. He was away, I will not say hobnobbing with the Chinese, but over there in Shanghai and other parts of China very properly looking into the evils of the opium traffic. But he was away from Parliament, and he was an important member of Parliament, and soon to become still more important by being a member of the Government. These little things the hon. gentleman has forgotten. In the multiplicity of things which crowd his grey matter, I suppose we should not be too hard on him if he forgets some of them. But for fear he has already forgotten this matter I must remind him, when he condemns the Government for having Cabinet ministers who are not members of this House, that Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. Richard Scott, Hon. Oliver Mowat, Hon. David Mills, all held portfolios in the Laurier Administration and occupied seats in the Senate, there being no opportunity of questioning them on the floor of this Chamber. A similar condition of affairs is a terrible thing at the present time because we are here and the hon. gentleman is there. But when he sat as a minister of the Crown in the Laurier Administration and some of his colleagues sat as ministers of the Crown in the Senate, that was perfectly all right and no criticism came from the hon. gentleman. Then responsible and representative government was not in danger at all. The hon. gentleman at that time was sitting to the right of the Speaker, and he was a Cabinet minister and, of course, he was a host in himself. What did it matter that three or four Cabinet ministers were away while Mackenzie King sat as a Cabinet minister to the right of the Speaker? He was capable of doing not only his own work, but that of half a dozen others.

[Mr. Edwards.]

There are just one or two other things to which I should like to refer, but I am not going to take very many minutes in doing so. My principal object in rising was to show, as I think I have conclusively and clearly shown, that the remarks of the leader of the Opposition with regard to the War-time Elections Act and the Military Voters' Act were remarks which come with bad grace, especially from him, and that his statements in regard to manipulation is not borne out by facts. I have the facts here in support of my statement which I challenge any person to dispute.

I want to offer a criticism of the Government. We on this side of the House feel we have a right to offer criticism where criticism is needed, and in this case I think it is due. Very briefly, my criticism is this: I want it distinctly understood that I as one of the members of this House of English descent think that the Government of this country should take action, and at once, to stop the Hearst papers from circulating throughout the Dominion. There may be some people in this country who do not object to the lies and dirt which are being circulated throughout the Dominion by this man Hearst, but I as one of the Anglo-Saxon race and the son of an Englishman resent it most strongly. I think it is a shame and disgrace to the Dominion for these papers to be allowed for one minute to circulate through the mails of this country. Let us at least attempt to be consistent. I have no sympathy with agitators like this man Ivens and some of those other fellows in Winnipeg, but what in Heaven's name is the good of putting Ivens behind the bars for giving expression to views which are likely to lead to riot, when we permit the Hearst publications to come into this country and sow seeds which cannot bring forth any other crop than disloyalty and disunion. I say that is not consistent, and I condemn as strongly as I can the lack of action on the part of this Government in not putting a stop to this sort of thing.

This is not the time to go into a detailed discussion of tariff matters. The proper time, as you, Sir, pointed out, to discuss the tariff is when the Budget is under consideration, and I shall therefore refrain from making any reference to the tariff until that time comes.

Before taking my seat, may I say in all kindness of spirit that I was sorry to hear the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) speak as he did the other day. He saw fit to tell this House that