

of the House about this. When he was wrongfully dismissed from office by reason of a corrupt bargain that will for ever disgrace the annals of parliamentary history in Canada, the electors gave him a majority of six; and that corrupt bargain had the effect of driving from public life every person who was a party to it, with the single exception of the man who is Prime Minister in the province of Quebec to-day. We had a federal election in September of the same year, and what was the result? The pendulum swung the other way; the Conservatives carried the day. In 1886 the Liberals again came into power in the province. In 1887 federal elections were held, and the Conservatives again had a majority. Now, here is the important point. In 1890 we had an election in the province, which gave the Liberals a large majority, and in 1892, two years afterwards, we had another election, when that majority was wiped out, and a majority of 33 was given the other way. Can I not say truthfully that the political pendulum in the province of Quebec oscillates between one party and the other? Can I not say that in our province eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, and that eternal vigilance, whether rightly or wrongly, has been exercised by the people? Now, if the recent election has resulted more favourably to this Government in our province than elsewhere, what was the determining cause? The determining cause, I venture to say, is that the people of our province were more audaciously deceived than the people of any other. They have been deceived on the school question, and in other respects they have been more audaciously deceived than the people of any other province. I will call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this fact, that the people of the province of Quebec have had the advantage of two object lessons. In the district of Quebec we had the Louise Embankment and the harbour improvements, well known to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). The other object lesson, which we had in the district of Montreal, was the Curran Bridge; and with these two object lessons before them, one can understand how the people of the province of Quebec went in the direction they did.

Now, let me look at the question of nationality. How has the province of Quebec as a whole acted in regard to that? You have had as Prime Minister of that province the Hon. Mr. Joly, a French Protestant, elected by a population of which 90 per cent was Catholic. More than that, you have as Premier in the province of Quebec at the present time an Irish Roman Catholic. These facts go to show the attitude of the province as a whole towards its public men, and how far the province as a whole considers these questions of nationality in meting out its political favours. But still more than that. From the condition of things existing

in the province as a whole, let us come down to particular instances. Let us take Bonaventure, where certainly 75 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Roman Catholic. Whom did that county return to Parliament? My hon. friend Mr. Fauvel. Take Quebec West, and what do you find? You find that that constituency, containing almost a majority of French Canadians, and certainly a very great majority of Catholics, returned my friend the Hon. Mr. Dobell, who is a Protestant. Now, take the county of Portneuf, in which 90 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Catholic. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) spoke yesterday about the Rouge curés of the province of Quebec. If I wished to refer to the role played by certain gentlemen in the last elections, the opportunity is now afforded me; but I do not think it desirable or necessary under the circumstances to do so. But this good French Canadian and Catholic constituency of Portneuf returned my hon. friend, Sir Henri Joly, notwithstanding the appeals, which I may characterize as desperate, that were made against him by men high in authority. Then, take my humble self. I represent the county of Quebec, which was formerly represented for many years by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), and in which at least 90 or 95 per cent of the population is French Canadian and Catholic. I contested that county in the local election in 1890, and my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) can well recall certain allusions which were made to my nationality at that time; but those allusions did not materialize, for I was elected by a very large majority. In the last contest the same thing occurred again. The same allusions were made, but they did not materialize then either, and you see the result before you to-day. Under these circumstances, is it not fair for me to say that in our province nationality and religion play but a very small role? If the members of this House would only come down to our province, and see our people in their homes, and the steady, industrious, virtuous lives they lead, there is not a man in this House who would not feel for them the same affection which we who live amongst them entertain. Mr. Speaker, I trust that we have now done with all these questions of nationality and religion. I trust that in this House we, who are the chosen of the people, will, by precept and example, show that the avenues which lead to places of power and power are open to all, and that no man's religion or nationality ought to be used either as a barrier or as a stopping-stone. Let the only question be citizenship and capacity to do service to the State. Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that the Prime Minister ought to be proud of the result he has obtained in the province of Quebec. If he had had his majority in the other provinces, I am quite sure—to borrow