

crime?—at least this grievous and sad mistake. It will certainly have to be changed. The general public pay the cost of this building, and the right and interest of the general public should have been considered when this Chamber was constructed. We have a very fine Parliament building here, probably the finest in the world. Being the latest building, it is the most modern and up-to-date, and it is a pity it should be spoilt by what I have pointed out as the defect in this particular Chamber. The galleries could very easily be extended by raising the roof on the outside. That might be done perhaps instead of moving the walls, because the moving of the walls might destroy the symmetry of the Chamber.

I cannot pass to other subjects without referring to this ceiling. It reminds me of nothing so much as a circus van. I think it is entirely out of place, and it shows very poor taste on the part of the architect, at least if he is responsible; and I must to some extent find fault with the honourable gentlemen who are on the Building Committee representing the Senate. They are both my good friends, and I am very sorry to have to say anything; but in a public way I am obliged to say to them that I think they have very grievously neglected their duty.

Now I come to the speech of my honourable friend from De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand), for I do not intend to take very much time. If this were a meeting of an antiquarian society, that speech of my honourable friend's would be perhaps in place. He certainly showed great antiquarian research in preparing that speech. He must have spent sleepless nights and laborious days in compiling the material for it. He travelled back to before Confederation, and came down step by step, haltingly and slowly, to the present day, when he got into the altercation with the Postmaster General, from which he emerged pretty badly scarred. I regret that the honourable gentleman did not see fit to admit he was wrong, and to withdraw. I can understand how it might hurt his pride to admit that he was wrong, because he is a very aggressive man, and I am inclined to be a little that way myself; but surely that is the proper thing to do. We cannot conduct the affairs of Parliament unless we recognize the rules of debate. When an honourable gentleman denies a statement, the only fair thing to do is for the one making it to take it back. The honourable

Hon. Mr. FOWLER.

gentleman opposite found very great difficulty in doing that, and when he did it he did not do it in a whole-hearted way, but grudgingly and as though he was forced to do so at the point of a gun.

The honourable gentleman has charged that the elections of 1911 were won by duplicity. I do not quite know what he means by that, unless it be that the issue was clouded by the victorious party, and I cannot see how he can possibly prove that there was any clouding of the issue. It was a clear issue as to whether or not we should have reciprocity or not with the United States; in other words, whether we, the free people of Canada, should hand over the making of our tariff to the people to the south of us. That is what the whole question resolves itself into. That was the bargain made by the two eminent delegates sent to the United States to negotiate with one of the cleverest and most acute statesmen in the United States, William H. Taft, and, to use a common phrase, he "put it over them for fair." We won by a handsome majority, and the country did not suffer in any way thereby.

Then the honourable gentleman comes down to the election of 1917, and he says—I want to quote his exact words, because I was a little surprised at these particular words: "The province of Quebec will never shake hands with this Government until we have revenge for the fraud of 1917."

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Revenge?

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Yes, revenge. You spoke of revenge. Here is what the honourable gentleman says: "Quebec has decided that it will not shake hands with this Government until the fraud of 1917 is wiped out." That means revenge, and the honourable gentleman spoke of revenge. What does he mean by that? Does he mean that, no matter how well the policy of this Government may suit the material interests of the province of Quebec, because of the War-time Elections Act of 1917 Quebec will not vote for this Government, but will choose rather a party with whose policy it does not agree? Is that what he says? Does the honourable gentleman mean to tell the members of this House that the people of the province of Quebec are so lost to all sense of their own interests, so lacking in foresight, so lacking in wisdom and sensibility, that for the sake of revenge they will do this?

The honourable gentleman speaks of mandates. What mandate has he from the