

sprung on the House, without the members being given any opportunity of knowing what the subject under discussion will be. I do not charge the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with being discourteous to the House, for he has followed the practice which obtains here of giving private notice to the leader of the House of motions he intends to present.

**Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.** I gave public notice from my place last night.

**Mr. OUIMET.** I must admit that I am then in the wrong; but I, in common with a great many people, believe in going to bed early. But, Sir, if notice had to be given to the House generally, it would appear in the Journals of the House, and then every member would have to take notice of it; and I think when important questions such as this come up for debate, every member should know it in advance, and not only two or three on each side; for I do not suppose that this House is a ring, and that we are here to witness two or three members on each side fighting for the flag. I think if notice were given in the Journals, the House would be in a better position to discuss these matters and pronounce a sound judgment on them. Now, Sir, with regard to the question under discussion, the principle laid down in the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford certainly commends itself to the common sense and the good judgment of the House; and I for one am ready to endorse it. For my part, I wish it had been followed in the past. But, Sir, things have gone differently. To-day, in another part of this building, a great state trial is going on. Two hon. members of this House are now under trial before a Special Committee, and I think it would be premature—not only premature but unwise—for this House to pass judgment in advance on those hon. gentlemen. We have not before us, as members of this House, the evidence which has been adduced, and I do not think it is right for the hon. leader of the Opposition to pass judgment, in the name of his followers, in the name of the House, and in the assumed name of the country, on those gentlemen now undergoing trial. The motion in itself I am ready to accept; but when I am told by the leader of the Opposition, that, by accepting this motion, I am going to endorse the remarks he has addressed to the House to-day, I say that I am not ready to do that. I am not ready to do what is not fair, and it is not fair now, when we have no evidence or documents before us, when the case for the defence has not been closed, to pronounce judgment, not a direct but an indirect judgment, and to say in advance that we should, on one point of that trial now in issue before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, namely, the testimonial presented to the ex-Minister of Public Works, pass our condemnation. I am not ready to do that, and I am sorry that we should be given a lesson of morals here. We all know what morality teaches, and we are supposed to know, just as well on the right side of this House as on the left; and these general propositions which hon. gentlemen opposite want to thrust down our throats, I say if I am going to swallow them at this moment, I will do so with a certain amount of distrust if not disgust. We know what the teachings of morals are as well as the Opposition, and I say this is not the right

time for them to give us these teachings, the more especially when they couple a resolution, which in itself is very good and cannot be refused by any one, with condemnations against hon. members of this House who are now undergoing their trial elsewhere, and upon whom we will be called in a few days to pass judgment. With these restrictions, I am disposed to say that the resolution is in itself acceptable and commendable, although the speeches with which it has been accompanied are not acceptable.

**Sir JOHN THOMPSON.** The hon. leader of the Opposition inferred from my remarks that I had formed a judgment on certain matters with regard to a case not concluded. In speaking of irregularities, scandals and so forth, I left that case entirely out of consideration as on which we ought not to speak, and was referring to a case on which I suppose we are entitled to speak.

**Mr. CHAPLEAU.** I rise only for a word of explanation, which is not exactly connected with the subject of the motion, but which is necessary after the remarks made by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think it is my duty to do so, as some effort has been made to connect me with disparaging writings that have appeared, in some time past, in the public press of this country. The leader of the Opposition, speaking of subscriptions and testimonials given to Ministers, quoted a pamphlet which he says emanated from *La Presse*, a Conservative organ. This is most unfair. That pamphlet was published during the Riel excitement by *La Presse*, which then headed the movement against the Government. The pamphlet is well known in the Province of Quebec as one of the most bitter attacks ever circulated during an election, a pamphlet which has been quoted to me again and again in the elections that took place from the latter part of 1885 until the elections of 1891. The little pamphlet I hold in my hand is the same as that which has been quoted by my hon. friend, and I may say misquoted. This is not the way in which a leader of a great party ought to instruct public opinion. He has not the right, in quoting from a pamphlet violently attacking the Government, to say it was an expression of Conservative ideas in the country. Here is the pamphlet, "*Le Métier de Ministre*," the most bitter, the most venomous pamphlet that was ever written against a man, and against the party with which he was connected. It was written against Sir Hector Langevin in particular, but it was also against Sir John Macdonald, and against the colleagues of Sir John Macdonald, and it extended its blame as far back as 1858. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the book, he will find that it goes back to the condemnation of the "double shuffle," in 1858; of what it calls the stealing of the elections in Quebec in 1871. I repeat that the newspaper which published that pamphlet was at the time the bitterest enemy of the Government of which I was a member. The reason of the explanation I am making is the position of *La Presse*. Up to 1884 *La Presse* did not exist. There was a newspaper called *Le Monde*, which was the property of the late Senator Sénécal, and another gentleman who was acting with him. That paper was bought by a certain number of Conservative friends from Quebec. That was an independent paper before, and it was continued in Montreal as