

have been clamouring, and are still clamouring for unrestricted reciprocity, that the motion the hon. gentleman from Queen's made, was not hollow and unmeaning? My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has recently been in East York. He has talked much in the same strain there, and the result has been that he has astonished the people of East York, and astonished some Liberal organs who have asked what has become of the Liberal leaders; and my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin), I take it, is one of the Liberal leaders. What has become of them? You do not know where to find them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would just like to say to the hon. gentleman that you would not find 21 of them voting on a swamp lot near the marsh in Toronto.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know what my hon. friend means by that. I do not own any swamp lot, and I know nothing about what he refers to. I say this, however, that hon. gentlemen opposite are like a live flea; you do not know where to find it; and those who were supporting them in East York were in the same inconsistent position that my hon. friend was in. When my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) brought forward his motion, which ought to have passed this House unanimously, hon. gentlemen opposite came forward with a buncombe motion, and if the *Times* was thoroughly conversant with the state of debate in this House for two or three sessions past, and had the exact motion of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) before it, perhaps, instead of dismissing it as a rhetorical phrase, the Thunderer would have come down with condign rebuke upon my hon. friend for bringing forward a motion that was insincere.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. Pardon; I withdraw that. I have no doubt it was sincere subjectively, but it was insincere objectively. I have no doubt that my hon. friend was sincere, but the motion, regarded in connection with the previous, and I believe present policy of his party, might be fairly called insincere. I say it was an inconsistent motion, and it might be described as buncombe. I do not know whether "buncombe" is parliamentary or not, but I believe it is. At all events if we follow the example of Congress it is. It was a motion that did very little credit to my hon. friend from Queen's, and it did very little to strengthen the position of the party of which he is an ornament in this House. A serious complaint is made here to-day, as though the party were misrepresented and injured in England, when the *Times* newspaper only gives a reference to the matter, and then proceeds with a long article to discuss the significance of the vote—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Of the buncombe.

Mr. DAVIN. Not buncombe; a vote, Sir, that has been echoed in the heart of the Empire, and a vote that will be echoed in every part of the Empire. I do believe, Sir, that the motion of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is the very first step towards the solution of some of the problems which have in recent years busied the minds of Canadian statesmen.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would have expected that upon an occasion such as this, where it is shown to the House that a fellow-member has been

Mr. DAVIN.

misrepresented by the leading organ of the British Empire, that the least that should have been done was that an expression of opinion should have come from both sides of the House that a fellow-member had been misrepresented. If I am to judge of the temper of hon. gentlemen opposite by the exhibition which they make now, instead of having regret, they rather rejoice because a brother member has been misrepresented. I will not say it was done wilfully, I would not go that length under any circumstances, but if it has not been done wilfully, when it was found to have been done I would expect expressions of regret rather than of rejoicing from hon. members opposite. If that is the tone in which debates are to be carried on, if that is the depth to which Canadian political life has sunk, it is a great pity for Canada at large. But, Sir, upon an occasion such as this, for my part, while not charging the gentleman who has been the author of this telegram with insincerity, whether subjectively or objectively, I say at all events that it should be his duty, as I understand he did afterwards, not only to call it to the attention of the paper by telegram, but to see also if possible that the mischief which had been done by the editorial comments of the paper should have been also explained away. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) so far has received no justice. It may be that a corrected telegram has been sent to the other side of the water, but that is no justice at all. He has been misrepresented in the columns of the *Times* the editor of which has done him a great injustice indeed, and he will receive no satisfaction until this injustice is corrected in some way.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry that these hon. gentlemen who are so indignant to-day, had not been equally indignant last year, when reams of falsehoods were cabled across the ocean intended to stab Canada, and to do her the greatest injury.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What were they?

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman knows well what they were. They were cablegrams that were a libel on the whole Canadian people, cablegrams without a particle of truth, which did an infinite amount of damage to this country, and yet, Sir, we have not, so far, heard from these hon. gentlemen across the floor of the House one word of condemnation that Canada was described in such terms as was contained in the false cablegrams.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I have a few words to say, not primarily upon this subject, but I cannot pass over some of the remarks made here without referring to them before I advert to the matter which principally brought me to my feet. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down says that reams of falsehoods were telegraphed last year across the ocean containing libels upon this House and upon the country. It would have been a grand thing for Canada if the statements cabled across the ocean last year had been falsehoods. They were accounts of the evidence taken before committees of this House. Most of those who gave evidence were members of the Government or civil servants, and if there was falsehood it was falsehoods told by them to their own disgrace and degradation. I would to heaven that those statements had been falsehoods, that the state of things had not been as bad as it was shown to be by the evidence of the men who incriminated them.