

read these statements. I have failed to see them ; but to put myself right before this House and the country, I just wish to say this, that I made no statement in North Grey or elsewhere that I had been sent up there by my leader to make any announcement. My hon. leader asked me to meet him in Toronto on Friday. When I got to Toronto, I received a telegram from him stating that he could not be there to meet a deputation from Owen Sound. The deputation invited me to go up and be present at the nomination. I was there, but my leader did not know that I had gone. As to French domination, while there I did make a statement to this effect. I said that, so far as the Manitoba School question was concerned, it was now for hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with it, that the country had pronounced against it, so far as the Conservative party was concerned, and that it was not our policy further than to hand it over to our successors in office to deal with. I made no statement for myself or anybody else, and the only reference I made to French domination was this : I said that the present leader of the Government, in apportioning the portfolios had, I thought, dealt unfairly with the province of Ontario. In the Government of to-day, Ontario had five seats and Quebec had seven. I said that in the late Government, we had one of the large spending departments, the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has proceeded for a considerable time entirely out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to make an explanation. The hon. gentleman has charged me with making a certain statement, as reported in the newspapers. I want to say that if the newspapers have reported me as saying otherwise than what I am now saying, they have misreported me. I have not read them. I want now to state what I did say about French domination, and if my statement be wrong, let the hon. member criticise it. The "Globe" misrepresented me, and, in speaking there on the second occasion, I challenged the "Globe" or anybody else to contradict the statement. And I challenge gentlemen opposite now to deny that statement. In the late Government we had the Department of Railways and Canals, one of the largest spending departments. That was taken away from us and was given to the Maritime provinces. We had the Department of Agriculture, and, as Ontario is the largest agricultural province in the Dominion, I think she was entitled to it. But that was taken away from us and was given to Quebec. Now we have four representatives—the Minister of Justice, who has not a spending department, two of the tax collectors, the Controller of Customs and the Postmaster General who sells postage stamps, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce who has not a spending department. The province of Quebec have six

members of the Cabinet and one member of the Government without a seat in the Cabinet. I thought Quebec had more than its fair share and I said so. The statement I made as to the numbers was correct, and my hon. friend cannot contradict it. I did not say anything more about French domination than that. I thought the hon. leader of the Government had dealt unfairly with the province of Ontario, and I think so still.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Here, Sir, is what the hon. gentleman is reported to have said, and I leave it to him, of course accepting what he has stated, to give any requisite corrections :

Mr. Taylor said that the circumstances of this campaign were different from the last, as the Remedial Bill was no longer a part of the Conservatives' policy. Sir Charles Tupper had sent word by him to this effect to the electors of North Grey, that good feeling had now been restored between Sir Charles and N. Clarke Wallace—

Does that extend to the other members of the late Government also ?

—and the other anti-remedial Conservatives. He said it was an insult to the intelligence of North Grey—

—Which the hon. gentleman will see they have resented—

—for Mr. Laurier to attempt to palm off in this riding a Minister who was defeated at home, and who did not own a cent here. A vote for Mr. Paterson would mean a vote for the domination of Quebec.

That, I am informed, is from the "Evening Journal" and it has appeared. I am assured, in a very large number of Conservative papers. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, will have influence enough to have any necessary corrections made.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the "Evening Journal" of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. And it appeared in many other newspapers as well. Well, Sir, it is satisfactory to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition and his whip can dwell together in harmony. We were afraid last night that the relations were likely to become a little strained, but it is satisfactory now to find that they understand each other. Sir, I think I am not going very far when I say that the plain truth of this whole matter, so far as the policy of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is concerned is that, with characteristic audacity, the hon. leader of the Opposition made a very bold bid for the Catholic vote throughout the Dominion. Unfortunately for him the Catholic vote was not for sale. I do not wonder at the disgust of the speculative purchaser to find that even so good a bid met with no response. Sir, the hon. gentleman is wroth and his valliant whip is wroth with the province of Quebec. And why ?