

ing you to the very honourable position you fill so well. If it were desired, I think I could refer to some pretty strong language of which very likely you, Sir, have a recollection on that occasion. Perhaps it would not be inopportune for me just to mention a sentence or two; and you will understand, Sir, that I am not citing this in any invidious spirit, but because my right hon. friend saw fit to criticise me more or less for the manner in which I dealt with this question yesterday. I have quite a long reference, but I will just read a sentence or two:

And what is the glorious end that is accomplished by this boodling? Why, Sir, it is to maintain the loyalty and unity of Canada to the British Empire, to maintain the old flag and the old monopolists, and surely that end justifies a great deal. The means to that end are the votes of public money, and what object could be more patriotic than to allow a reasonable and sufficient proportion of those public moneys to filter into the pockets of the Minister and then be disseminated among the electors for the good of the old flag?

And then, further on:

Besides, a man who can raise the wind for election purposes so well as the Postmaster General, is invaluable to that party; he cannot be spared; they will have more elections, and they will want him again.

I did not make any exhaustive research into any of the other precedents, but simply took the "Hansard" of 1882, which I happened to have in my hand, for the purpose of reference, and I do not make these references with any idea of reproaching hon. gentlemen opposite, but merely with a view of showing why I thought they should not consider me as having too warmly supported the resolution I submitted. I may say to the right hon. gentleman that I am always very glad to accept any suggestion from him as to the mode in which business ought to be conducted in this House. He has great parliamentary experience, and I do not take any suggestion of this kind from him in bad part at all, but am very glad to receive it. And what I have said with regard to the matter is only an attempt to justify any warmth I may have exhibited.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am quite willing to meet the hon. gentleman on the ground he has taken, and since he has been kind enough to refer to the little experience I have had in Parliament, I may be permitted to tell him that I do not think the examples he quoted are at all apposite to the criticism he offered. I may say at once that the language he used yesterday would have been quite in order, if the Government had taken the same attitude on the question which the late Government did on similar occasions, and which brought forth the replies of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon. friend who oc-

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

cupies the Chair (Mr. Edgar). If my hon. friend had consulted the authorities, he would have perhaps found a more apposite authority in the opening speech of the hon. gentleman who moved the motion against Sir Adolphe Caron, rather than the speeches in reply to the refusal of the late Government to grant an inquiry. Unless I am greatly mistaken—and upon this point I am quite ready to stand corrected by the hon. gentleman—I think he quoted from the speech made by the mover of the resolution, not when he made the motion, but in reply to the attitude of the late Government in refusing an investigation on that occasion. My hon. friend quoted the remarks of my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce, also made in reply, but he no doubt did so because he assumes that this Government would do as the late Government did. That was his mistake.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And as this Government has been doing.

THE RESTIGOUCHE BOOM COMPANY.

Mr. McALISTER moved that Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Restigouche Boom Company, be referred back to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills for further consideration. He said: I may say, by way of explanation, that this Bill was before committee yesterday morning, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) requested that it be merely discussed, and not passed. A great deal of discussion took place on the Bill, but while a great many objections were made to the details, none was made to the principle of the Bill itself. Mr. Busted, who was the only one appearing to take objections, took the ground that the structure should be placed at the foot of the islands, some two or three miles above the point indicated in the Bill. In reply, I gave the opinion of experts who had examined the locality, that this could not be done, and the objection of Mr. Busted was the only one to the merits of the Bill. There was no objection to its principle. The hon. member for North Simcoe took objection to a great many of its details, and I admitted my willingness to accept an amendment covering the objections which he took. It was then suggested by the committee that the Bill should be referred to a special committee of three, and reported back to the committee. After that was agreed upon, the chairman said that the proper course would be to pass the preamble, and then refer the Bill to this special committee, on the distinct understanding that the passing of the preamble was not to be accepted as an indication that the Bill would be passed by the committee. On that understanding, the preamble was submitted, but quite a large number of members in the committee who were prepared to support the principle of the measure, had