

telephone and could transmit the compliment to the great leader of armies wherever he may be. (Laughter.) Then the ex-Finance Minister compared—I am bound to say that when comparisons come from this side of the House and I do not agree with them, I am prepared to express my opinion—compared, not I think very appropriately, the Prime Minister to Nebuchadnezzar. I do not recognize the appropriateness of the comparison of the leader of the Opposition to Thersites any more than that made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he compared the leader of the Opposition, not to an individual, but to the whole body of the Israelites of Egypt spoiling the Egyptians and then going out into the wilderness to search for gold. But they did not go to search for gold; they went into the wilderness to go to the promised land and were fed on manna in the meanwhile. If the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) is now in the wilderness, he is as certain to go to the promised land as were the children of Israel, although to do it would not take forty years. (Cheers.)

Let me say, as I am speaking of the forms of these speeches, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce—I am sorry he is not in his place—for a man of his experience in Parliament, for a man of his social culture, was guilty of one of the most extraordinary parliamentary crimes that has been ever committed. What was that? I deprecate, unless under extreme necessity, bringing the name of His Excellency into debate in this House. But what did the Minister of Trade and Commerce do? He actually made a reference, which I have here—it would be unbelievable if I could not refer to it—in order, as he thought, to make a point. Because the leader of the Opposition brought before the House certain utterances of His Excellency—the Minister of Trade and Commerce actually suggested that my honorable friend should not have done what no doubt he thought was his duty. And why? Not because it was wrong, not because it was an unpar-

liamentary proceeding, but because he was the recipient of a tribute from their Excellencies on an interesting occasion. This is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said at the close of his suggestion that it was the Tory party that burnt down the Parliament buildings:

"If I am not altogether mistaken "in recalling a certain interesting occasion, not so very long ago, in this "city, among the many costly tributes "which were tendered to the hon. "gentleman, not the least costly, not "the least elegant, was one presented by the exalted personage referred "to. Therefore, I infer that the hon. "gentleman is not so implacable as he "seems."

What the hon. gentleman means to suggest is that the acceptance of a present or gift from a man occupying an august position, by a man occupying one of the highest positions in the Colonial Empire of Britain would be something in the nature of a bribe, a bribe for silence or for expressed flattery. It is one of the most scandalous things that ever took place in Canada, and it is especially scandalous coming from a man of the years and authority and occupying the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce. (Cheers.)

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) used a phrase which I believed has been unjustly dealt with on this side of the House and even by his own colleagues. I believe injustice has been done to him. The right hon. gentleman said that when the historian sat down to write of Canada he would take the years 1867 and 1897; and I must say the hon. member for York fell into what I deemed an error. He fell into this interpretation of the remark of the Premier, that what he meant was this, that the historian would be troubled exceedingly by the wonderful events that occurred in the summer of 1896 and he would have nothing to say respecting all the events that passed during the previous thirty years, but he would write a history of the country from 1897 on; and the Minister of