

State, I much regret it; but it is my humble opinion that I have only used a right clearly admitted, and that I have always kept within the bounds of legitimate defence.

I will add, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that I formally deny that I have ever calumniated the Honorable the Secretary of State.

I have the honor to be, Mr. Speaker, your humble servant,

A. E. POIRIER, *Translator of the "Hansard" Debates.*

To the Hon. J. A. OUMET, Speaker of the House of Commons.

(Translation.)

OTTAWA, 2nd June, 1887.

MR. SPEAKER,—I acknowledge with alacrity the receipt of your communication, enclosing me a letter addressed to you by Mr. W. B. Ives, the member for Richmond and Wolfe.

Before answering the numerous charges made against me, permit me to remark to you that our office is under the immediate control of a Committee of the House, and to enquire of you whether I should not address my answer to that committee. Nevertheless, as I am exceedingly anxious to remove the unfortunate impression which that letter must have made upon your mind, I take the liberty of giving you a few explanations, which I shall endeavor to make as brief as possible.

You know me, Mr. Speaker; you know that while I may be charged with openly expressing my opinions, I am not accustomed to make use of language unworthy of a gentleman. I have always been careful to respect my adversaries, among whom I did not reckon any as my enemies. As a journalist it has been at times my duty to blame the Government, but I have ever done so in polite terms. As an elector of the County of Richmond and Wolfe, I opposed the election of Mr. Ives, but, contrary to what he insinuates in his letter, I conducted myself in such a manner as not to have cause to blush at it.

Let us proceed in due order and see in the first place in what that letter errs on the score of exactness:

1. It is not correct to say that at the meetings which I attended I made use of violent and insulting language against the Government, and it is still less so as regards Mr. Ives. I condemned the policy of the Government in relation to the North-West. I did it in a general manner; I made a political question of it, and I carefully avoided any kind of personality in its treatment.

2. It is not correct to say that at a public meeting held at Danville on the day of the nomination I interrupted him, or any other speaker, frequently, as he has stated, or even in any single instance.

3. It is incorrect to say that I wrote insulting articles in the newspapers about Mr. Ives and the Government. I wrote twice in the "*Progrès de l'Est*" letters in which there is no reference whatever to Mr. Ives or to the Government. I deny most positively that I ever mentioned the name of Mr. Ives in any newspaper in Canada.

4. Mr. Ives accuses me of being a violent partisan; I have always heretofore been reproached with being the very reverse.

5. Mr. Ives finds me unworthy of the position which I occupy. The question of fitness having been determined by means of a competitive examination, before my appointment, that point may be set aside. As to my conduct, it has always been sufficiently regular to enable me to sustain with credit the test of a fair examination.

Our position is not the same, in any respect, with that of members of the civil service. The latter are directly dependent upon the Government, whose members are taken from one political party alone; whereas we are under the House of Commons, which is made up of representatives of all shades of opinion. The House by the voice of several of its members has recognized that we have the right to take