

I do not pretend to say that my hon. friend is correctly reported. But he was thus reported in the *Montreal Star*, and if misreported, I think he owes it to the House to say so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg to state that this report is entirely incorrect. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. White, Leeds) will do me the honour to read the other *Montreal* papers of the same date he will find my speech reported verbatim. I am sure he will credit me with at least knowing that the Tariff Commission Bill was rejected by the Senate last year. But, as regards the farmers being represented on that commission, he will remember that when he introduced the Bill I asked him if the farmers would be represented. No doubt, it is upon some reference I made to that matter that this report is based. But I am sure he will see that I could not have made the speech attributed to me by the *Star*. The error may be due to the fact that English papers in the province of Quebec sometimes send reporters who are not familiar with the French language. My speech was reported fully in *Le Canada* and with considerable fullness in the *Montreal Gazette*. And I would trust the *Montreal Gazette* for the accuracy of the report of my speech.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It goes without saying that I accept entirely the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) that he has been misrepresented. Under the circumstances we can understand how it occurred, for he spoke in French and has no doubt been misreported in the translation. Let me do him the justice of saying that it did not seem to me like him intellectually—that is he would have known that the Tariff Commission had been thrown out by the Senate. But as he has spoken about the representation of the farmers about which he asked me in the debate on the Tariff Commission Bill, no doubt he will remember what I said. I said I would not reject a farmer because he was a farmer, or a labouring man, or a business man, or any other because of his occupation or calling; that my conception of the Government's duty was to appoint the best men that could be found.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Except a free trader.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Why, there are not any left in Canada. We would have to get a man from England. And the first to get up in his place and object to bringing in a man from England would be one of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Getting away from the cement duty and the 'trusts, mergers and combines,' and getting into freer air, I desire to give atten-

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

tion to some remarks of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). It seemed to me the hon. gentleman was in what I might call the doleful dumps with regard to the election in Macdonald. He submitted ex parte affidavits relating to a matter which, I believe, is before the courts, and which I do not intend to deal with, not being acquainted with the facts. It seemed a little curious that the hon. gentleman should bring these forward in connection with the Address. But I think his reason for doing it is obvious. He desired to draw a herring across the trail; he desired to mask his defeat in Macdonald. He and many of his colleagues went into Macdonald and fought under the banner of reciprocity with the United States and free trade within the Empire—absolutely inconsistent things in many ways—and were badly beaten. And I think it was to mask that fact that he brought these charges before us. We cannot sift these charges ex parte. The hon. gentleman files affidavits; some one else files affidavits; how much further on are we in a knowledge of the facts? What progress can we make in criticising the administration of justice in Manitoba which is not within our jurisdiction? I have no objection to inquiring, so far as may be necessary into facts that existed in Macdonald at the time of the election. But it does seem to me that my hon. friend desired to divert attention from the great outstanding fact that the constituency of Macdonald, a year after the general election, by an enormous majority, especially in the rural districts, proclaimed to the world that the great prairie province of Manitoba was forever done with reciprocity. Now, what about reciprocity? (I had almost said, what about Absalom?) My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was strangely silent in his remarks upon the subject of reciprocity. A year ago he said it was passion and prejudice that had triumphed at the polls. And yet on this occasion, he is silent as to reciprocity.

Let me point out to the House that the great issue that still divided the two parties in this country is precisely the same as existed in September last year. The reciprocal legislation of the United States is still upon their statute books, and all that is necessary to make the reciprocity agreement effectual as between the two countries is similar legislation on the part of the Canadian Parliament. I think my right hon. friend owes it to this country and to this House to state precisely what stand he takes to-day upon this question. Would he, if he came over to this side of the House, introduce the necessary legislation to make effectual the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States? In his speeches throughout the country