

strange change in regard to the discussion of this issue in this House. I remember very well that the counsel for Manitoba, the hon. member for Simcoe, just before the late election for Cardwell, very happily defined the position which obtained between the three parties—if we may dignify his party as one—at that date. This was the position :

If a Liberal candidate comes forward without any policy except that which Mr. Stubbs supports, why should the forces be divided, and the Government candidate walk in between them? If the Liberal candidate, whoever he may be, wants further information, then you have these three positions to choose from. If you want the Government sustained in their determination to reimpose separate schools upon Manitoba, you will vote for Mr. Willoughby; if you want further information, you will vote for the Liberal candidate; and if you are opposed to the re-establishment of separate schools, you will vote for Mr. Stubbs.

Three issues, three positions. Where is the leader of the Opposition to-day? Whose policy has he now put into your hands, Mr. Speaker? Did he ever, directly or indirectly, in any province, say that he would vote for the six months' hoist of a remedial legislation Bill? Up to the very date that he moved it, I believe he was in favour of this policy, as the member for Simcoe understood it, a policy for a commission, a policy for an investigation, a policy consistent with remedial legislation. But when the hour came that he is called upon to screw his courage up to the sticking point, the hon. leader of the Opposition, forsooth, took shelter behind no less a man, or no greater a man, than the hon. member for Simcoe, counsel for the government of Manitoba, in favour of the most drastic and cruel coercion that has ever been perpetrated in any province of Canada. But the hon. gentleman thinks he made it all right; he moved a six months' hoist, of course; and then he is able to say in Quebec, and he is able to say in every Roman Catholic district: Look at my speech; it is true I adopted the policy of the member for Simcoe, it is true I went into the Equal Rights Association, and got a policy for the occasion; but nevertheless I supported it by a splendid speech in favour of ultimate remedial legislation. Only I want an inquiry, and I want something to stand upon after the awkward circumstances of a general election have passed by. And so he adopted the straddle-back policy. What did the "Globe" say, for instance, speaking for its Protestant readers in Ontario, of the position of the leader of the Opposition:

May's Parliamentary authority makes it clear that the six months' hoist is a complete negative, and kills the Bill, and does not postpone it; and also proves that it is the only way of completely killing the Bill. A vote against a Bill, May says, can only be made effective by carrying the six months' hoist, because if the second reading is barely negatived, it does not dispose of the Bill except for the time, and the Bill may be proceeded with at a later stage.

Again the "Globe" says, speaking for the benefit of the ultra-Protestant readers of that paper:

Any opponent of the Bill must, therefore, vote for Mr. Laurier's amendment, and all who vote against it must be classified as supporting the Bill. There is no other motion on which they can record hostility to such legislation.

Now, then, all we want, all we want, at any rate, as Conservatives—and certainly the vast majority of the Conservative party are true to the cause of justice to the minority in Manitoba—all we want is a straight and above-board issue. The "Globe" lays down an issue upon which I would gladly go to the country. Mr. Speaker, you have heard often times the leader of the Opposition, in eloquent tones, carried away by—I won't say vanity, but by his enthusiasm and reading of English history, boast that he was a Cobden at one time, a Peel at another, a Gladstone at another, a Liberal of the English school at another; and last year he went over the province of Ontario endeavouring to make the people believe that he was a modern Wellington, that he followed Wellington's tactics, and he had thrown up defences, and copied that general's tactics in the Peninsular campaign. Whoever thought, what enthusiastic supporter of his, ever dreamed that with these grand exemplars, with these splendid campaigns before him, he would go outside the lines of Torres Vedras and scamper about before the people in the tattered remnants of the habiliments of the hon. member for Simcoe? In 1896 he adopted the policy that last year was laughed to scorn. Last year the hon. member for Simcoe was so poor that no one would do him reverence; he could not divide the House, he ran away from one division. I do not know what general in English history ever did that. But nevertheless that is enough to show that he has never aped the English general. But running away from one, when another opportunity came, in vain he asked you, Mr. Speaker, to divide the House, and test the sentiment of the House on the policy of the Government. He had no power, no influence; as weak as the letter "p" in the word pneumonia was the hon. member for North Simcoe in 1895, but a great and mighty man is he this session. He can lie back and let this discussion go on; he can attend the courts of law and exhibit his great forensic ability; he can take Parliament as one of the easiest events of life, because he has now in full cry the whole of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. They sacrificed him in 1895; they laughed him to scorn, they left him standing alone, and forsooth now they do his mischievous work, now they give him life and give him standing which but for them he never could have in Canadian politics or in Canadian public life. Mr. Speaker, I have to say something further about the extraordinary position in which we find the Roman Catholic leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. I have not