

as it stands on our statute books is nothing else than an open door for corruption, and although I was laughed at some few years ago when I expressed my views upon the subject and supported them by my vote, I see now that I was right, and that the majority were wrong on that question. I still believe that unless you punish by imprisonment or even by a term in the penitentiary, whoever may be found guilty of resorting to corrupt practices, you will never be able to stamp out the evil. I feel that if we wish to do our duty as legislators it would be better to wipe that law from the statute book. Then there would be no law to break, and the extent of the evil would be confined to the corruption, while now you have a double crime—corruption, and the breaking of the law which prohibits it.

One word more, and I have done. Before I sit down I wish to congratulate the two gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address, and especially the hon. member from DeLorimier, who deserves much praise for the manner in which he discharged his duty. In his own Province he is known as an eminent barrister, and his reputation probably preceded him here. He has shown on this occasion that he will be an ornament to the Senate as a representative of the Province of Quebec. I regretted, however, that when he spoke of emigration and expressed a desire to see more of his own friends coming from France to settle in this country, that he did not add a few words more. It is all very well to invite the French people to the Dominion, but if they have to learn the English language I am afraid that they will not be willing to settle in Canada. I wish the hon. gentleman had spoken of that which is most important, I mean the constitutional right of the French people in Canada to have a representative of their own on the Treasury Benches in this branch of the Legislature, because if we do not begin at one end of the work we will never reach the other. No doubt the hon. gentleman forgot that. I do not reproach him for it, but I desire to complete the argument which he began.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—It is usual to allow the minister representing the Government in this House to close the debate upon the Address, and I had

hoped that I had accomplished that yesterday. My hon. friend from DeLanaudiere, in the exercise of a right which undoubtedly is his, has seen fit to depart from the usual custom, to follow me in the discussion, and although I have addressed the House once upon the resolutions before us, I think the House will allow me, and will think it desirable that I should make a few observations in reply to the hon. gentleman on the subjects to which he has drawn attention, subjects of undoubted importance and which deserve the attention of the House, but which I think the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere approaches constantly in a spirit not well calculated to procure the results for which he seeks. The hon. gentleman takes two positions, one of which I think to be tenable, the other untenable. It is undoubtedly desirable that there should be a French Canadian Minister in this House. We all acknowledge that. It has been the practice to have a French Canadian Minister in the Senate, and I am sure everyone regrets that it is not the case at present. On several previous occasions when the hon. member for DeLanaudiere called attention to this subject, I expressed my regret, and expressed my anxiety that we should have such a representative in this Chamber, but hon. gentlemen know very well, and I think the hon. gentleman from DeLanaudiere, from his long experience in Parliament, knows as well as anyone, how difficult it is to accomplish those things in the way we desire, and I wish to point out, as I have done before, that it really rests not with the Government, not with the Premier primarily, but really with the representation from the Province to which he alludes, Quebec. If there really was, and if there really now is, an earnest and strong desire on the part of the representatives of the people from the Province of Quebec to have that change made, and to insist upon it in the constant and unreasoning way that the hon. member from De Lanaudiere does—I do not want to say it in an offensive way—no doubt it would be done, but I fancy the majority of them see that it is impossible on all occasions to accomplish these things. You cannot always maintain that symmetry which one would like to see in public matters. You cannot always

HON. MR. BELLEROSE.