

that the House is a fair representative of the feeling of Canada, also has been to a large extent done away with by those Acts of Parliament ordinarily called Gerrymander Acts, under the operation of which the members in this House do not by any fair arithmetical calculation represent the feelings of the people of Canada. Another principle of which we are all proud, and which we all suppose was firmly implanted in our Government and in our constitution, was the pure, unsullied administration of justice in this Dominion. We have been wont to pride ourselves, when comparing Canada with the country at the south of us, upon our difference in that respect, at least from many parts of the United States. While it is possible, I am sorry to say, to cast the most serious reflections upon the administration of justice in many portions of the United States, particularly in the large cities, it has in the past been the pride of Canadians to point out that here at least justice was pure and unsullied, that no matter how much we might disagree and how bitter our conflicts might be on political questions, we were all united in upholding the purity of the Bench, and in upholding the Minister of Justice of the day in dealing out even-handed justice to the criminals of Canada. Again, the hon. gentleman can show that by the practices, not of his predecessors, but of himself and his own Government, this principle bids fair to disappear, or if not to disappear, to become materially weakened. The hon. gentleman has been able to make for himself a name as being stern as adamant when a criminal came before him and asked for pardon, and as giving to each case the most careful attention, and taking every pains to see that justice was administered sternly and that pity had very little place in dealing with those matters. In that respect the administration by the hon. gentleman of the important Department of Justice has met with the approval of the people, and I regret very much indeed that within the past few weeks the hon. gentleman's record has been so seriously broken in that respect. The hon. gentleman has shown that while he was prepared to deal with the ordinary criminal in that manner, a kind of criminal has come before him who requires different treatment and special consideration. And why? Because those criminals were of such a nature and were possessed of such information that they were dangerous to the hon. gentleman and to his Government. While the hon. gentleman was prepared to defend the people of Canada from any trouble in connection with murderers, robbers and thieves of the ordinary kind, yet when it came to a question which might endanger him in his possession of power and endanger the seats more especially of certain colleagues, he was able with that ingenuity for which he has become celebrated, to find reasons and arguments why justice in that case should be perverted and pursue a different line. And

Mr. MARTIN.

what, Mr. Speaker, is the argument? I have alluded to two kinds of arguments which the hon. gentleman has produced here for our consideration. One is: that if his Government is arraigned for a mistaken policy it is a sufficient answer to show that the Liberals have made a similar mistake; another is: that if his Government is arraigned for a certain policy, it is still more clearly sufficient for him to show that his Government and his predecessors in office have made the same mistake. There is a third kind of argument, a new principle of criminal law which he adduces. The hon. gentleman introduced his criminal code too soon; he should have waited until this new principle could have been incorporated therein: the principle that if imprisonment turns out to be bad for the health of an unfortunate criminal he is entitled to his release. I would remind the hon. gentleman that within the past few days another criminal, similar in nature to Mr. Connolly and Mr. McGreevy, has fallen into the toils of the law, and has been convicted of a serious crime, the crime of perjury, and I would point out that in this manner I expect for my province the same kind of justice as is administered in the province of Ontario. There is one thing that we are strong upon in Manitoba, and that is provincial rights, and if it is proper and right in the province of Ontario to release a criminal because there are other criminals behind him who should be there also, then I say that Mr. Chamberlain, who has been convicted of perjury in connection with the election in Winnipeg, would be able, if that is a correct principle, to produce superiors to him and men back of him who are really responsible for the serious crimes he has committed. Now, Mr. Speaker, after excusing the long delay in calling the session with the kind of argument to which I have alluded, the hon. First Minister tells us that he has waited thus long in order that he might know what to do with the Canadian tariff, through the action of the American people in connection with their tariff. The hon. gentleman gave us very meagre explanations of the policy of the Government in connection with this great question. Speakers on this side of the House have been urging the Government to give some more definite explanations of the reasons which have induced them to announce their adherence to the policy of protection. Having waited as they have done for so many months in order to learn what the American people were going to do with this question, the Government should be ready to tell us now what they will do. I am not sure, that it was not a natural position for them to take, because having departed in trade matters from the policy of the great nation of which we are a part, and having adopted the trade policy of the Yankees, for whom they profess so little esteem, it was natural indeed that they should look to their masters in the art of protection to know what was to