

less than a three-fourths vote of the legislature. They feared that the Protestant population might be deprived of a certain number of their representatives. They did not grant that request, but Sir George Cartier and my hon. friend the member for Charlevoix came forward and said: "It is humiliating that we should have special terms proposed to us, but we will do anything that we can to prevent your privileges being interfered with." And what did the Liberals do? They voted that the Protestants of Quebec should not have that privilege, and one Conservative member abandoned his party allegiance, refusing to follow Sir George Cartier, and voting against the Government, who were desirous of meeting the wishes of the Protestants. I ask the Postmaster General if, after such an act on the part of the Conservatives, he has a right to reproach them as he has done? Then, with regard to immigration, the Leader of the Opposition has spoken of Mr. Edward Jenkins. When the Confederation Act was framed, Sir A. T. Galt, who was then the leader of the Protestants of Quebec, believed that if the immigration question was left entirely to the Local Legislatures, we in Quebec, would discourage it. He required that it should be left to the concurrent jurisdiction of the Dominion and Local Legislatures. Our leader, Sir George Cartier, submitted to this second humiliation, and agreed to give them this right, which was more than a right, and I say it is ungrateful of the Postmaster General to say what he has said. There was another question of vital importance—education. Again Mr. Galt had apprehensions if the Protestant minority were left to the tender mercy of the Catholics that they would not be fairly treated. He required, before the Confederation Act was passed, that a Bill should be enacted giving to the Protestants all the rights they desired in case they should not get them later. The number who moved to give them that right was the hon. gentleman from Charlevoix, another of those reactionary Ultramontanes. The whole thing failed only because a member from the Province of Ontario moved that similar rights be given to the Catholics of that Province. The measure was lost on

Mr. Masson.

account of the opposition of the Liberals of Ontario, and not of the Conservatives. On that occasion the present Leader of the Opposition, while being unflinching in guarding the rights of Ontario, when the interests of his co-religionists in Quebec were at stake, was willing to give us equal rights. He stood by us when Mr. Howland and Mr. McDougall abandoned us. Even lately, only a few months ago that reactionary, that Ultramontane ministry of Mr. DeBoucherville, has given the greatest proof of its liberality to the Protestant population of this country, A deputation of Protestants went to Quebec and asked that ultra-Catholic Government to give them a special asylum for the insane. The Protestant ministers and medical attendants came forward and signed letters showing their co-religionists had all the liberty they wanted and were put on the same footing as the Catholics in that Catholic institution. Mr. DeBoucherville said, notwithstanding, that if they were not satisfied he was ready to do the utmost he could for them. I say, then, it is unkind on the part of the hon. gentleman to use such an expression towards the Ultramontanes of Quebec and call them reactionary. The Hon. Premier has tried, in a letter sent to the public, and he is still trying to-day to smoothe down this speech. In his letter he says hardly any question involving religion can arise in this country. If that is the case why did he allow or why does he not disapprove of the speech of the Postmaster General, who to-day, comes and makes an appeal to the Protestants of Quebec against the Conservatives. If there is nothing to separate as on religious and spiritual grounds, how is it that the Postmaster General comes before the public and calls upon the Protestants to unite against the Conservatives? And how is it that the hon. gentleman, knowing the feeling of the Protestant population of Quebec and of the whole Dominion, instead of saying he disapproves of the Postmaster General's remarks, says the hon. gentleman was not understood? If he was not, it is because the English language cannot be well understood. The Prime Minister has given as his political belief that equal