

ority displayed in not opposing the majority. I am not here to explain the cause of these laches. I do think we need not go very far for the reason, and I dare say before this debate closes we will learn it; and I call upon hon. members who represent the Protestant constituencies in Quebec, to tell us whether they accept the doctrine of my hon. friend behind me. I ask the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver), I call on the hon. member for Bromé (Mr. Fisher), I call on the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) to let us in Ontario understand whether there is the turtle dove, peacefulness, existing between the Protestant minority and the Catholic majority in the Province of Quebec which the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) depicted last night. I call on them to state here whether there is nothing but billing and cooing between these separate and distinctive parts into which that Province is divided. My hon. friend's language would seem to imply that. The Protestants enjoyed every Protestant liberty—really, they were allowed to manage their own little Protestant affairs as if there was no majority at all. They were in no way thwarted, interfered with, or troubled by this majority, and the instances he cited to us of this spirit of toleration on the part of the majority were, to my mind, unfortunate and unhappy. Mr. Joly was one. He was, I believe, the leader of the Liberal party, as my hon. friend has stated, but has my hon. friend forgotten modern history? Has he forgotten that Mr. Joly was deposed from his position, or resigned, because of the impossibility of acting? Has he forgotten that Mr. Joly actually resigned his seat, and that practically he was driven out of public life?

Mr. LAURIER. He was always opposed by the minority.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, so much the worse for that minority. I say that minority has no reason to plume itself upon Mr. Joly's successor. Those who opposed him in former times must certainly now look back with regret.

Mr. MITCHELL. You mean Chapleau, Ross and the others. You cannot mean Mercier also.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not mean you, and that ought to be quite sufficient for my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), nor do I even mean his organ, the *Herald*. Another example cited was the Protestant paper, the *Witness*. The *Witness* had never said anything. I do not know how that may be. But is it true that the *Witness* was excommunicated, and remains still under the ban of the Church? Is it not true that the people of a certain religion cannot buy the *Witness* newspaper, under the pains and penalties that may follow thereon? That did not seem a very happy way of manifesting the toleration of the majority of the Province of Quebec. At last my hon. friend's argument culminated—will he pardon the world—in what appeared to me the acme of absurdity, when he said the Protestants recognised no right in the Jesuits of a legal kind. The Protestants disclaimed that there is any moral claim. The Protestants were opposed to the introduction of the name of His Holiness the Pope as—did he use the word pestiferous? or what was the word almost as strong—a bitter pill for them to swallow. But they did not do anything. The Act took away from them their education fund. By one short clause it is declared that the education fund hitherto belonging to Protestants and Catholics alike shall become a part of the general revenue of the country, and that out of the general revenue of the country \$60,000 might be paid to the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec; and not one word was raised against this Act of spoliation.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). Where is that to be found?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the latter part of the Act, if the hon. gentleman will read it.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec). I have not seen it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot make the hon. gentleman read it. And there is not one word from the Protestant minority. It is easy to understand how they get on, as he says, if they submit to all that injustice without a word of remonstrance. It is easy to understand how happy they can be if the Protestant minority are willing simply to take what they can get, a seat here occupied by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), with a seat in the other House given to the representative of the majority. My hon. friend tells us that no Protestant can be elected in the Province if the majority chose. If the Protestants come here from that Province only to carry out the behests of the other side, they are a deception. We do not realise their position, because we understand that they are representing the minority, but it appears that they are truly the representatives of the majority, and we are told that, if this cry is raised, if this body is assailed, if we venture to raise our voices in this Parliament, we are going to raise such a cry that the Protestant representatives from the Province of Quebec will lose their seats. I cannot believe that that is possible. I cannot believe that my hon. friend is right in thinking so; but even at that expense, even at the expense of the loss of my hon. friend from this House, which, together with that of other members, would be a calamity to the country, though I cannot believe that that would be the result of a fair, full, frank and calm discussion of this subject, although it is one which trenches upon feelings which are guarded most sensitively, still that would have to be borne. For these reasons, I venture to think, it will not be found that my hon. friend's statements are correct. As he made the statement, my eye caught the report in a newspaper that petitions were being signed in the city of Montreal, that already 3,000 names had been obtained to those petitions, and that more were coming in—petitions to the Governor General, calling upon him to disallow this measure. Does this look as if the Protestants of the Province of Quebec were desirous, and willing, and anxious that this legislation should remain unchanged, or does it not look as if the Protestant minority in that Province were given reasonable encouragement, that they would get justice—and no more than justice are they entitled to, and no more than justice I hope they will ever ask for—from the Parliament of this country? Then they will be up and doing, to do their share of this legislation. But in the Legislature of that Province, composed as it is now, they cannot expect it. There was no Protestant representative in the Cabinet of that Province until recently, and, when one was chosen, he had to be elected in spite of the vote of the Protestant minority. I can understand that, if there were a fighting man in that House like the hon. member who leads the Third party here, there might be a chance of obtaining something like justice, but men with that skill and ability, with parliamentary knowledge to back it, are not to be found every day, and we are not to judge the Protestant representatives of the Province of Quebec on that high standard. We were told that the *Herald* had not said anything about this iniquitous scheme, though the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) said that, if he had been there, he would not have approved of it. I have not heard anyone approve of it. It has gone without defence. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) does not approve of it. Perhaps my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) does approve of it, in his great desire to have perfect religious liberty, and not to drive the French out of Ontario. My hon. friend caudally told us that he would not have approved of it. Then, what muzzled the great organ of public opinion? Was it because it was the organ