

we speak in a language foreign to us. Now the hon. gentleman says we laid down the rule of having no representation in the Senate, and the Province of Quebec admitted it.

HON. MR. MASSON.—I did not say anything of the kind.

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—Well, it was said that the popularity of the Government has shown that the people of the Province of Quebec endorsed it.

HON. MR. MASSON.—I said that notwithstanding the fact that there was no French Minister in this House, the country was so well satisfied with the Ministry that we formed, that they gave us continually their support by overwhelming majorities.

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—I will add that if this support was given to the present Government, it was due to a certain extent—in fact to a great extent—to the action of the members of this House. And I am sure I will have the evidence of my hon. friend on the other side (Mr. Belle-rose) to prove that on one occasion where a Minister of the Crown was elected by acclamation, he would not have been so elected had we not taken care to avoid the question of representation in the Senate. Now I must ask the Minister of Justice if we ought to take it as a challenge?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—Take what as a challenge?

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—The hon. gentlemen from Mille Isle put it in this way,—that it shows that the people are satisfied.

HON. MR. MASSON.—The hon. gentleman must not misrepresent me. I know he would not wilfully do so, but what I said was that the fact of the continual approval we have had from the country—the proof we have lately had—shows that the Government has the support of the country. I would ask if the hon. gentleman means to say that I indicated at all that if there had been a French Minister in the Senate, we would not have had the same majority?

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—No, but the question as it is put now—if we sincerely

believe that we should have such representation here in the Senate, then we are put in this position,—we must shew you at the next election how it will be. This is a question which cannot be taken otherwise. I recollect the hon. gentleman from Sorel (Mr. Guevremont) telling me last year, "Well you will see that these gentlemen will not open their eyes unless some of them be defeated on this very question." Well I think that he was right, and I think the time will come—although I do not wish to say anything disagreeable to hon. gentlemen—when the payment of \$4000, to buy an adversary will not be enough to have a majority in most of the Counties of the Province of Quebec.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.—I think that my hon. friend from DeSalaberry is a little too hard on me. How is it possible for me to answer that long letter, having never heard of it or seen it before? I think a great deal might be said on the constitutional question, but I would rather not say it now as I think the moment is not opportune. Then as to the personal observations I do not press them at all, but some personal observations fell from the hon. gentleman from DeLanau dière which I thought it necessary to reply to, and I naturally fell into a manner of expression which the hon. gentleman from DeSalaberry may have misinterpreted. So far from throwing out any challenge, I had no intention to do so, and I shall only be too glad to have my hon. friend's support on all occasions.

HON. MR. TRUDEL.—This letter was only the summing up of some of the results which I gave in the pamphlet which I published some two years ago, and which was sent to the Minister of Justice, and in which all those arguments were dealt with. I may add that I had not the good fortune, though I repeated my invitation several times, and had received some flattering letters from statesmen in Europe—even from Lord Beaconsfield, and one from Constantinople from our late Governor-General—to receive any acknowledgment from any member of the present Government that it was worthy of perusal.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 6 o'clock.