

gentleman that he is not in a position to tell me that the language of Lord Dufferin, which I have just quoted, was inaccurate, at least so inexact that it should not be found in a Speech from the Throne; because I turn to the speech in which His Excellency took leave of the Parliament of Canada and read language put into his mouth by the hon. member for Bothwell himself, in which these words occur:

My interest in Canada shall not cease when my mission as Her Majesty's Viceroy shall have terminated.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

Mr. MARTIN. Just before the House rose at Six o'clock, the First Minister conceived that he had found an answer to a point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and asked the special indulgence of the House that he might speak the second time upon the question, and that he might give this House an answer to that point. Are we to infer from that circumstance that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side have no answer whatever to make to the very serious arraignment made against their policy by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House? Indeed, when we come to examine the answer which seems so conclusive to the First Minister upon the point in question, it amounts to this: He admits that the point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell is perfectly correct, but his answer is, and from his own standpoint he deems it a conclusive answer, that once upon a time the Liberals made a similar mistake. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when the Liberals come into power in this country and their policy is attacked, if by any chance it should happen to be wrong, it will be an exceedingly easy matter for them to defend themselves by similar logic, because I can fancy no error in legislation, no mistake in public policy which it would be possible for the Liberals in power to fall into, as to which they cannot find ample justification in the misdeeds of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, previous speakers have referred to the question of the French Treaty, which the hon. the First Minister considers a very small matter. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that my presence in the House this evening is not in some degree, at all events, connected with this exceedingly small matter. The hon. gentleman who preceded me, as representative of the city of Winnipeg, gave his explanations to his constituents of the reasons which induced him to take the rather unusual course of resigning his seat in the House, which he did, and I fancy I am casting no reflection upon that gentleman in suggesting, that possibly, inheriting as he does some of the cunning for which his dis-

tinguished father was celebrated, he possibly has found it necessary not to give to the public all the reasons which induced him to take that course. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the distinguished gentleman who brought into being this exceedingly small treaty, has a representative in this House and a representative in this Government, and representatives who are exceedingly closely connected with the gentleman who preceded me as the representative of Winnipeg, and it has been more than hinted that the failure of the hon. gentlemen opposite to ratify the treaty negotiated by the High Commissioner was not agreeable to the business associates of my predecessor, and that was one of the very strong reasons which induced him to vacate his seat. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the hon. First Minister in connection with the policy of the Government as announced in the Speech from the Throne. The hon. leader of the Opposition made the statement that it was an unwritten law of this House that Parliament should be called together in the month of January. The hon. First Minister was able to meet that statement in a conclusive manner, not by showing that the Liberals when in power had called the House in the month of March, but by showing that his Administration and that of his immediate predecessors had been guilty of great delay in convening Parliament, and that during the last twelve years six at least of the sessions had been called later than the present one, and the hon. gentleman appeared to think that was a conclusive answer and wiped away the law which the leader of the Opposition stated had become an unwritten one. It seems to me that if logic of that kind is a sufficient answer to charges of that nature and is sufficient to wipe out of existence a law which had sprung up from years of usage, the hon. gentleman can meet almost any argument in that way. We in Canada are in danger of losing many of the great principles which are supposed to underlie the legislation of this country, if those principles are to disappear merely from the bad practices of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a principle of the constitution that members of this House shall be elected by the people of the Dominion. The hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured most successfully to violate that principle, to enact a law in which the members in this House will not represent the constituencies which are carved out for them in the Representation Act—I refer to the Franchise Act, which gives to the large railway corporations, that have the ability to carry large numbers of the electors from point to point, the power of electing members to this House, instead of such power being in the electors of each constituency. Again, in such respect the hon. First Minister can show by the same relentless logic that the fundamental principle which presupposes