

after they joined him they trusted him implicitly, because they found him to be an honourable man and a great and patriotic Canadian who never let the base concerns of partisanship interfere with his duty to the people of this great country. Therein he differs from the honourable gentleman who spoke the other day; who was brimming over with political partisanship; who could think of nothing but political partisanship; and who could only be happy if he could once more dip his hands into the political flesh pots.

Hon. Mr. DOMVILLE: Should not he have a chance with the rest of them?

Hon. Mr. TANNER: Not only in Canada, but the world over, no man stands higher than Sir Robert Borden. He stands high in the councils of the Empire; and no man occupies a higher position in the estimation of the French people at this time; no man is regarded as a greater statesman than he. In the great republic to the south of us I am sure that he stands for uprightness, honour, and greatness in statesmanship. As followers of the Union Government we are proud of him. The honourable gentleman from De Lorimier says that no French Canadian would tarnish himself by following him. We are proud to follow a man who stands head and shoulders, and I think rightly so, over any other political leader in this country. He stands as high as any political leader there ever was in this country, if not higher, and he is the peer of any political leader in the world to-day.

Now, honourable gentlemen, I am about to conclude these remarks which, without much preparation, have of necessity been rambling and longer than I intended to make them. There is just one further remark that I wish to make about the honourable gentleman to whom I have referred. Not only was his speech overflowing with political partisanship, but it was entirely empty of any great suggestion, and absolutely devoid of one substantial idea which would be helpful to the people of this country. Moreover, from beginning to end, there was not one real criticism of the record of the Government of Sir Robert Borden since 1911, or of the Union Government since 1917. The honourable gentleman satisfied himself, as such critics usually do, with general statements. Instead of taking up the Government's record, item by item, and challenging it, he was content with the general statement that the Government had done nothing. It was his duty, if he had any ideas which would tend to the better-

ment of this country, to make suggestions and recommendations. But he left us without one suggestion, without one idea. Talk about brainless leaders. Talk about headless parties. What kind of head would he make, what kind of leader would he be, when he has nothing to propose, nothing to suggest, but satisfies himself with empty criticisms, and, I may say, violent attack. I want to say in conclusion, honourable gentlemen, that for these reasons I was greatly disappointed indeed with the speech of the honourable gentleman from De Lorimier.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Poirier, the debate was adjourned.

REVISION OF PUNISHMENTS BILL.

MOTION FOR SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS moved the second reading of Bill B, an Act to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments.

He said: The Bill of which I have the honour to propose the second reading is one which does not require explanation. It passed this honourable body in the year 1918, but unfortunately it passed at a very late hour in the Session and did not reach the House of Commons. Last year the Bill was referred to committee, and after being fully discussed it was again passed by the Senate; but owing to the lateness of the hour it failed to pass the other House. It is unnecessary for me to take up time in discussing this matter again. The Bill is a very simple one. It provides that where a magistrate or a judge has erred in imposing a sentence, application may be made to a Court of Appeal, and if one of the judges of that court considers it is a case for the court to deal with, the court has the right to examine into the facts and decide whether the sentence was a proper one or not. This Bill does not involve the question of appeal in criminal cases; it simply provides for the rectification of any error that may have been made either by a magistrate or by a judge. I am happy to say that in my opinion there will not be many cases in which application will be made, but there is no doubt that grave miscarriages of justice sometimes occur, and according to the methods by which the criminal law is administered in Canada, there is no remedy. Canada is, so far as I know, the only British country in which there is no redress where an error has crept into a criminal trial.