

ed and set aside the constitutional remedy which they should have supported, and were influenced purely and solely by a sectional cry. Many causes, in my opinion, two or three at least, besides that one, operated in my native province. I have no hesitation in saying that the business depression which has existed for some time not only in that province but in the whole country, contributed in some measure, in no small measure, to the change to which I have just adverted. It is undoubtedly the case that the depression which has existed not only in Quebec, and not only in this country but in other countries, operated as a factor, urging the people in that blind way which undoubtedly is followed under circumstances of that kind, and to vote or express their desire for some kind of change. I remember, Sir, in my own constituency an old French Canadian said to me: There are many speakers here to-night, but there is one who attends every meeting, whom you cannot keep away, and who is working steadily against you. And when I said: who is that speaker? he said: It is Mr. Crisis. In other words, there was undoubtedly in my own province a feeling that business was bad and that a change would not make it worse, and that even possibly some beneficial result might be obtained by a change. But in furtherance of the object which I have in view, the vindication of my province from the accusation that the people voted blindly for one of their own race, I will say this, that even in regard to that great constitutional question which was so lengthily discussed during the election campaign, there was undoubtedly in the minds of the people of my province a feeling of doubt. There was a feeling of doubt, which I think it is easy to understand when all the circumstances are considered under which that question came before the people for solution during last spring. This question was discussed at length and formed a subject almost unique for discussion during the by-elections which took place in my province last autumn or in the early part of the winter. It must not be forgotten that upon those occasions the leaders of the party then in power solicited the support of the people upon the distinct understanding and promise that that question was going to be settled and that the Remedial Bill would be passed without a doubt at the then ensuing session of Parliament. Of course, the causes which led to the non-fulfilment of that pledge, which resulted in the failure to carry out that promise, are well known to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the members of this House; but to the people at large it appeared strange, after the pledge given, that they were not carried out. It was difficult for them to understand why they should not have been carried out. Then, again, undoubtedly operating as a factor to contribute to that state of doubt in which the people of my province found themselves, there was the

withdrawal at a critical moment by Mr. Angers from the then Ministry. It is to me clear that the non-passage of that Bill during the last session, the peculiar circumstances, not easily intelligible to everybody, which accompanied the non-passage of that Bill, the position taken up by certain members of this House, and the state of business and trade just on the eve of the elections, were elements which contributed, at all events in my province, to some extent, to the result which became known to us on the evening of 23rd June. But, Sir, I will not deny that operating with those causes there was also side by side with the pledges given by every candidate favourable to the advent to power of the hon. leader of this House, a feeling among the French Canadian people that everything considered they would have one of their own race to lead the Government of this country. Well, Sir, in view of the circumstances which I have indicated it will not be for me to blame them. It is a feeling which to me is intelligible. It is a feeling which I can understand and with which I can sympathize. But, at the same time, it seems to me that this confidence which they have placed in one of their own, invites him in a particular manner to the performance of his duty towards the electors of this country, and of his own province. I trust, Sir, that he will see fit without undue delay, to give us a clear, outspoken, and categorical exposé of what his policy is, not only in regard to trade matters but also in regard to that question which I have already spoken on. For my own part, Sir, I hope that we will hear very little during the present Parliament of race questions, for a great deal too much it seems to me has been said about these questions hitherto. I will not speak of French domination.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why?

Mr. MONK. I do not believe that there is such a thing as French domination. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better not to speak of the inhabitants of my province as Frenchmen. There are no Frenchmen properly so called in my province. They are now British subjects, and, as has been very ably said by one of our past statesmen: they are British subjects speaking the French language. They are not Frenchmen properly so called. They are Canadians, and on the morrow of that eventful day, nearly 150 years ago, when they passed under British domination they were allowed to abandon this country and to return to the country of their birth. Many of them did so, but the descendants of those who remained here are loyal subjects to the British Crown. Their history from that period onwards is one which does them infinite credit. What they ask to-day, is merely, that they be recognized as forming part and parcel of this great Dominion, as being co-heirs in the inheritance of all these great constitutional