

of friction, and doubtless the process was very easy. We removed the cause of friction, and doubtless the process was very easy. We removed the cause of friction as we might remove all causes of friction, by giving up everything demanded of us, and there so far and no further, no doubt the hon. gentleman has scored a success. Now, Mr. Speaker, having spoken like my hon. friend of what the Speech does contain, I have a word to say in regard to what the Speech does not contain. The Speech does contain an allusion, not in very glowing terms, but still in terms sufficiently glowing, to the great diplomatic victory obtained abroad, but by a singular omission, for which it is difficult to account, the Speech contains no allusion to a much greater diplomatic victory which the Government obtained at home. Sir, there can be no doubt whatever that a few weeks ago the Government of Canada were in a very awkward position, to use a vulgar phrase, they were in a remarkably tight place. There can be no doubt whatever that the Government of Canada by the exercise of diplomatic skill successfully avoided a very great danger. There can be no doubt whatever that it required no trifling exercise of finesse to enable the Minister of Justice to get those injured innocents, Messrs. McGreevy and Connolly out of jail in good time before Parliament met. Had they been in durance vile when the House assembled, I shudder to think what might have been the consequences to the hon. gentlemen opposite. They might have spoken inadvisedly with their lips, they might have furnished much most curious information regarding the inner machinery to which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues owe their seats in this House. I really think the success of the hon. gentleman deserves special mention in the Speech from the Throne: I might also say that it deserved a *Te Deum Laudamus* with which generals are wont to celebrate their great victories. There is another consideration. The hon. gentleman is great in precedents; in his time he has established some remarkable precedents. He established a very remarkable precedent in showing how to deal with charges presented against members of the Cabinet. Now, the hon. gentleman has established another precedent, which will be of great use no doubt in the future, namely, how to deal with ex-M.P.'s who happen to know too much. I desire to know is the Minister of Justice prepared to apply this rule? Is the Minister of Justice prepared to declare in future that if a prisoner finds his health suffers from confinement he is prepared to discharge him after he has gone through about one quarter of the punishment the courts believed adequate to the offence? I know that the Minister of Justice is not very strong in political economy. I have not myself discovered that he is a very great adept in matters of arithmetic; but the hon. gentleman is a lawyer, the hon. gentleman is an ex-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

judge, the hon. gentleman is the author of a criminal code of more or less value—rather less than more, according to Mr. Justice Taschereau, but that is not a point I intend to dwell upon. Anyhow, the hon. gentleman is the chief executive officer of the Department of Justice, and I want to know whether he is prepared to apply this rule? I want to know whether he is going to give equal British rights to all classes of men, equally and indiscriminately? Sir, it is known to me, and probably the Minister of Justice, that there are many persons now confined in the several prisons and penitentiaries of this Dominion whose health is suffering from confinement. I am informed that the collective sums, for the theft for which those worthies are in prison, would not amount, all put together, to more than ten per cent of the sum for the embezzlement for which McGreevy and Connolly were confined, and I desire to know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to recommend the release of these prisoners, and if not, why not? I am told on good medical authority that one hundred prisoners, or thereabouts, in Kingston penitentiary alone, were taken down with typhoid fever during the last year. Will the Minister of Justice permit the release of these patients, who undoubtedly have suffered in health by reason of this confinement. I am prepared to say—though I do not speak with authority, not having had any communication with them—that these prisoners would not be unreasonable, and if distinguished personages should be afraid that the Minister of Justice was too tender-hearted and too easily imposed upon, I am sure these prisoners would be quite ready to submit their cases to Dr. Wright, or to any other medical authority that might be suggested. Very far be it from me to criticize anything that may be suggested by a distinguished personage such as I have alluded to, but I must say that I think that it was not altogether necessary to employ the medical expert I have referred to, and for this reason: it would have been quite possible for that distinguished personage to have obtained, without going outside his own council walls, ample corroboration of the views of the Minister of Justice. Mr. McGreevy and Mr. Connolly may have much to complain about, and I dare say they have, but Messrs. McGreevy and Connolly certainly cannot say to the Cabinet at large: We were sick and in prison and ye visited us not. If I am correctly informed, there was not a week—I am not sure there was not a day—during which to their credit be it said, some member of the Cabinet, some one of His Excellency's advisers did not cause the door of the jail at Ottawa to open, in order that he may hold sweet counsel with Mr. McGreevy or Mr. Connolly. Whether that arose from pure philanthropy or from a pardonable curiosity to see what accommodation might be provided in Ottawa jail for persons who are convicted for embezzling