OTTAWA LETTERS.

Senator Ferguson Lends the Government a Helping Hand.

Text of Premier Laurier's Letter Suggesting that the Pope Should Interfere in Canadian Affairs.

The Adjournment of the Bogus Prosecution Enquiry a Decided Triumph for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper—The Matter Will be Gone Into Fully Next Session.

OTTAWA, June 3.—The government is not building any Yukon railway by subsidy to Mackenzie and Mann and will not allow any one else to build one. Two or three bills before parliament were withdrawn yesterday on the announcement of Mr. Blair that the house would be called upon to prevent the chartering of any road making connections with the United States bounday. Two of these charters were sought by companies wishing to build by the shortest route from the Lynn canal. One of these is Hamilton Smith's company. The other was a company whose charter was sought in the house by Mr. Gillies, M. P. Either of these was willing to build a road to the deep water terminus, to meet the Yukon river hundreds of miles below the point where the Stikine railroad would have met it. Either of them was willing to deposit a quarter of a million dollars as a guarantee that it would go on and build the road without government aid of any sort. The government has decided that it will not allow such charters to be given. Yet we shall perhaps be told that the senate is responsible for the failure to establish railway communication with the Yukon. As a matter of fact, however, the senators only delayed the construction for a few months, because Mackenzie and Mann are constructing the road for which the country was asked to pay four million acres of picked Yukon gold lands.

The position of the government in the present action is perhaps not unstatesmanlike. It was unstatesmanlike and unbusinesslike to fling away those gold lands for what amounted to nothing, but having failed in that, there is something to be said for the action of the ministry in heading off railway charters before the coming convention with the United States. It may be worth something to the United States to have this route thrown open, and if the privilege can be made an asset in the coming negotiations, it is very proper to preserve it.

As there is no railway there is a natural desire on the part of transportation companies to establish some sort of monopoly over the wagon roads. The railway committee is disposed to guard the Yukon people from these monopolies. A company applied for a charter to construct a land route by way of Lake Bennett, and charge tolls thereon. There appeared before the committee a man from the Yukon who has something to do with transportation. He claimed that he and others were already using the route, which, he says, the company proposes to acquire, improve and hold for its own use. He represented that over part of the distance it would be impossible to have more than one wagon road. The company applying for the charter was supported by the minister of railways and had been promoted by Col. Domville, whose son is one of the directors. After a sharp discussion in the committee the question was narrowed down to the issue whether a toll road should be permitted. The committee decided in the negative, and the Domville bill was dropped.

Before this letter is printed it may perhaps be known what action the government will take regarding the senate amendment to the franchise bill. There are many amendments on matters of detail, most of them referring to Prince Edward Island. Senator Ferguson, who is a much more clear headed and accurate man than Sir Louis Davies, was able to show the minister of justice that the bill as framed could not be made to fit in with the provincial system in that province. He made the case so clear that Mr. Mills was the first to propose an amendment to some of the clauses. Other clauses the minister of justice promised to amend at his leisure, and two or three he regarded with doubt.

Probably Senator Ferguson did not mean it, but the amendments which he suggested and which were accepted cut the way from under the feet of the minister of justice later in the day. After four or five suggested changes had been adopted, Senator Miller offered his amendment in favor of an appeal from the reviser to the county court judge in cases where the provincial law did not provide such an appeal. There was nothing revolutionary in the proposal. Sir Wilfrid had himself favored a general system of judicial revision. He said that it was already enforced in Quebec and Ontario, and he hoped the other provinces would adopt it. Therefore it is clear that there is no objection to the idea itself. Again Mr. Mills could not object to the senate taking action in regard to the franchise, for his whole party in the senate had voted in favor of taking action only a few years ago. He did intimate that the senate ought not to amend the bill, but should either accept it or reject it. But the senator from Prince Edward Island had caught him very neatly on that point by securing his consent to a number of previous amendments.

The minister of justice declared that the government would not accept Senator Miller's amendment, which was supported in a very strong speech by the mover. He claimed that it struck at the very principle of the bill and interfered with provincial control. It was shown to him that on half a dozen matters the government had already consented to interfere with provincial control. But Mr. Mills wanted to draw the line somewhere, and he drew it at this point. Sir Mackenzie and Mr. Ferguson pointed out that the conservative party in the house of commons had recognized the right of the majority to change the franchise system and had endeavored to assist in making the bill as good a measure as possible. The opposition leaders in the senate declared that they had no other motive than to improve the measure as far as that could be done. They commended the solicitor general for his fairness and his disposition to accept suggestions from the other side of the house. The government declined, however, to accept this one, and it was carried by a vote of 34 to 16. Two or three conservatives, including Mr. Baird and Mr. Poirier, voted against the amendment on the ground that the refusal of the government to accept it might mean rejection by the commons and the withdrawal of the bill, together with the plebiscite.

Mr. Mulock is in a more conciliatory mood than he was last year, or at the beginning of this session. At first he would not hear to the proposition that his superannuation bill should only apply to future appointments. The argument was strongly made that those now in the service should be left subject to the conditions on which they joined it, but the government would not admit the justice of this claim. Yesterday, however, the admission was made and the bill was so amended on the motion of Mr. Mulock himself. The opposition need not be too proud over this achievement. It was not they alone who accomplished it. A good many liberals have been pressing the government against Mulock's proposition; most of them privately, but one or two, Mr. Ellis for instance, on the floors of the house. Mr. Ellis put the matter as a question of good faith and of contract, and no doubt his argument had due weight. Then there was the pressure of the junior clerks themselves, including all the young men appointed since the change of government. As is well known, the ministers have found places for a good many hundred friends of theirs, and these were anxious to be put on as good a footing as the older civil servants.

Mr. McMullen put in an angry protest. Mr. McMullen, who backs the ministers up as well as he can, had supported Mr. Mulock in refusing this concession. The postmaster general made it without consulting Mr. McMullen, and the member for Wellington had somewhat the same feeling that took hold of Jonah when Nineveh was not destroyed after he had prophesied against it. So Mr. McMullen waited for his opportunity, and when Mulock proposed that the government should pay four per cent. interest on the deductions from salaries under the new system, McMullen proposed that the rate be three per cent. H could not see why a civil servant should get more interest than a Savings Bank depositor. Mr. Foster pointed out to him that even his own amendment offered the civil servant a half per cent. more, and Mr. Mulock explained that this payment was not interest exactly, but was also a slight contribution on the part of the government, much less than is paid under the present system. It was shown also that while the Savings Bank depositor can deposit if he likes and withdraw when he pleases, the civil servant is obliged to pay whether he desires it or not. For five minutes Mr. McMullen looked round the chamber for a seconder, rather hoping that none would appear that he might avoid the vote. But Rogers, the patron, was not disposed to allow one man to occupy the lonely eminence of patriotism, and so he climbed to the rescue. The vote stood, McMullen and Rogers on one side and all the rest of the members on the othr. Each of the two prevented the other from adopting the motton of Athanasius. "Ego McMullen contra mundum" would have sounded well. But Rogers spoiled it.

The judges' bill called out more discussion than had been expected. It did not dawn upon the house until Mr. Foster explained it that the measure increased the cost of administration by some $27,000. Apparently it does not increase the efficiency. It provides more judges for large districts like Montreal and leaves the same number as before in small and scattered districts where it is said the courts have very little to do. The ministers, and especially the solicitor general, admit that a reorganization and redistribution of the judges would make this expenditure unnecessary. But they say that the provinces alone can make these changes and they do not do it, therefore the dominion must appoint more judges and pay more bills. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Mr. Casgrain, Mr. Foster and others object to this, claiming that if the provinces will not adjust their judicial system economically they have no right to ask parliament to meet the additional cost. However, the bill goes.

Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper divided the house with the usual party result on the question of retiring county court judges at the age of 75. This bill does not touch the judges of other courts in that way, but singles out the county court judges. Sir Charles holds that while it may be right enough to apply this rule to judges who are to be appointed, it should not apply to those now on the bench. The result of it is, however, to create two vacancies at once in Ontario and provide for two or three more within a year or two, while it will provide vacancies in the other provinces before the next general election.

There was a time when a wild war whoop would have been sent up against such a project if the late government had devised it. Cameron of Huron, sometimes called "Ananias" for short, would have flourished his tomahawk and started out on the war path. But Cameron of Huron goes on the war path no more. On the slight eminence that overlooks Pile-of-Bones-Creek he will sit and smoke those everlasting cigars of his, while he draws a salary as lieutenant governor of the Northwest. For him there are no more attacks on the poor missionary preacher who shut out Mr. Tarte's jamboree from his Indian school. For him there are no more election courts, where the judge shall say that he ought to have been disqualified. Nor yet for some years to come will Cameron howl out his stormy superlatives against the members who sit in the house with commissions in their pockets. All this session Cameron has been sitting and voting, and during the last half of it at least he had this judgeship in the inner pocket of his coat. He has left, and with him goes the most furious denouncer of corruption that ever corrupted a constituency, the wildest advocate of the independence of members of parliament who ever sacrificed his own independence. And far away in Prince Edward Island sits the Hon. David Laird, studying over the promise made to him of this same governorship which he will now never see.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 4.—The minister of justice declined to accept some of the amendments proposed by Senator Ferguson to the franchise bill, as well as the one proposed by Senator Miller in regard to the appeal to judges from the revisor. But some of the suggestions of Mr. Ferguson Mr. Mills was very glad to accept, and he ought to have been grateful for them all. It would have been good enough party politics for Mr. Ferguson and his colleagues from the island in the senate, and for Mr. Martin and Mr. Macdonald in the other chamber, to have allowed the bill to go through without any Prince Edward Island amendment. The result would probably have been the disfranchisement of every human being in Prince Edward Island and the production of a beautiful object lesson of the industry and capacity and care of the minister of marine. It would also have been shown how illogical and unbusinesslike is the attempt of the government to fit on to a general election system the various laws and devices in operation in the provinces.

It happens that Prince Edward Island alone of the provinces has no electoral list and in its local elections does not use the ballot. Now the franchise bill proposes to adopt the ballot and certain election methods, but through carelessness and by reason of the difficulty of fitting together a lot of different conditions the bill as drawn did not provide for working the ballot properly with the Island system. In the commons Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Martin pointed out that clauses in reference to the voters' lists had no meaning so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, because there was no voters' lists. The solicitor general, who worked like a beaver over his awful task, made an effort to straighten things out, and Sir Louis Davies, whose loose habits of thought are better adapted to reckless attack than to constructive legislation, confused the matter with various suggestions. But when the bill reached the senate there still remained notwithstanding a number of provisions excepting Prince Edward Island. One clause which seemed to include that province required that every voter should be registered before he could get a ballot. This section would shut out every man in Prince Edward Island from the polls. Mr. Mills was ready enough to amend this clause and give the Prince Edward Islanders a chance for their lives, or at least for their liberties.

Then came another snag. In Prince Edward Island, in the case of a scrutiny after a provincial contest, there is no difficulty in setting aside illegal votes. The voting is open, and if it is found that some one has voted who has not the right, it is only necessary to examine the poll book, discover how he voted, and strike out the vote. But in the dominion law, where the ballot is introduced there is no such remedy. Under the bill as introduced in the senate, if a question arose in the trial of a petition or a recount touching the qualification of a voter in Prince Edward Island it would be possible to ascertain whether he had a right to vote. But after that the court could do nothing about it. The ballot would be in the box along with the rest, and nobody would know for whom it was marked. In the other provinces the qualification of the voter is tried and settled by the revising officer or the court of appeals, if there is one, and therefore the appearance of a name on the list is a proof of the qualification. In Prince Edward Island in provincial elections every man comes in and votes subject to objection and of course to subsequent enquiry. The bill makes objection and subsequent enquiry impossible.

Senator Ferguson offered an amendment to meet this case. It provided that if any person desired to vote whose right is questioned on the ground of qualification, and if objection is taken, the deputy returning officer shall number the ballot paper and shall place opposite the name of the voter a corresponding number. In this way if the vote is proved to be bad it can be traced and deducted from the count. This amendment Mr. Mills did not accept, though he has not shown how he proposes to get along in Prince Edward Island without it.

Then there is the case of "special votes," which is an institution peculiar to Prince Edward Island. Under that system voters in one district who have a qualification also in another, deposit with the returning officer in their own district votes for candidates in all the other places where they have qualifications, and these votes are transmitted to the district where they belong and counted there with the others. The franchise bill before parliament provides that non-resident votes shall be polled in the dominion as in the provincial elections. But it provides no method by which these special votes can be taken account of by the returning officer. Senator Ferguson suggests that the bill be amended to provide that in the province of Prince Edward Island, as elsewhere, all votes shall be given personally. Mr. Mills appeared to be grateful for this suggestion.

Still another difficulty arose over the oaths to be taken at the polls. The bill provides that the oath used in provincial elections shall be adopted in the case of a man who has occasion to swear that he has not voted before in the same district. Under the form that this bill established the elector would only need to swear that he had not voted in the local electoral district where the poll was held. As there are four or five local districts in some dominion constituencies it would appear that a man might vote several times for the same candidate. Mr. Mills, who is very profound, but not very quick of apprehension, was induced to see the point of this objection and get himself to work to provide an oath to suit the case. These are some of the corrections which Senator Ferguson has succeeded in making. They were absolutely necessary to make the bill at all workable in his own province, and if the government or Sir Louis Davies have the instinct of gratitude, they should be devoutly thankful to their opponents, who have kept them from making themselves objects of ridicule from Tignish to Souris.

Senator Landry is still amusing himself with the government and its correspondence with Rome. His latest discovery is a letter signed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and addressed to his eminence Cardinal Rampolo, secretary of state to the Roman court. This is the letter:

OTTAWA, 30th October, 1897.

Eminence—I made known to you, in the month of August last, when your eminence did me the honor to grant me an audience, the happy result whoch the mission of Monseigneur Merry del Val had accomplished among the Catholics of Canada, and the profound expression which his high Christian virtues and his talents as a statesman—I say statesman, and the impression is not too strong—had created in all classes of our population.

Having now returned to my country for several months, I I wish to make known to your eminence that, if these happy results are to remain permanent and efficacious, it is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry del Val should be renewed, or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.

I have established, since my return, that there is among a certain class of Catholics an underhand agitation against the work accomplished by Monseigneur Merry del Val, a work of pacification, concord and union.

The same reason of state which inspired his holiness in the affairs of France, and which caused him to prescribe to the Catholics of this country the duty of abandoning the old strifes of the past and to accept the state of things agreed upon, has quite as much force in Canada as in France.

Such is the opinion of a great number of the Catholics among us. I admit that it is not the unanimous opinion; this very divergence of opinion only renders more necessary among us the presence of a man at once firm and conciliatory like Monseigneur Merry del Val, and of one who above all would understand all the danger there is of exasperating the men who are sincere, convinced, and who wish to be faithful to their duty as Catholics, while remaining faithful to what they believe to be their duties as citizens.

May I be permitted to ask your eminence to be good enough to lay these considerations before his holiness, while assuring him at the same time of my profound respect and of my filial attachment.

Accept, eminence, the expression of the high consideration with which I remain, etc., etc.

Senator Landry wanted the government to state whether this letter was genuine, but the secretary of state refused to give any information about it.

The same day Mr. Landry brought up the question of the statement made by the secretary of state when Mr. Landry had asked him some questions about Charles Russell's letter. Mr. Scott said: "The hon. gentleman produced a document written to one of "the ecclesiastics of the church to "which I belong, which I may say if "the document is genuine has been "purloined from Charles Russell or "Cardinal Rampolo. It has been im"properly obtained, and it has been "obtained in such a way that no "gentleman would use it in a mat"ter of this kind." As Mr. Landry was the man who used it in matters of this kind the statement implied that he was not a gentleman. This happened two or three days ago, and yesterday Mr. Landry made a statement that the words were an imputation upon his character which he had a right to vindicate. He therefore proposed a resolution that "the sena"tor from Stadacona has in defence of "his own honor a right to ask, and "the dignity of the senate requires "imperatively that such accusation "should be proved or withdrawn. "Therefore resolved, that provided "the secretary of state do not with"draw such accusation, a special "committee be appointed with in"structions to inquire into the facts "and report their conclusions to the "senate."

This led to an interesting discussion. Senator Scott seems to have been inquiring into the history of these letters, for he said that he had information from the vatican and also from the government agent in London who wrote one of them, that three letters had been stolen from the vatican. He insisted that this was all private correspondence and should not be used in the house, and was particularly anxious that there should be no enquiry. Sir Mackenzie Bowell would not admit that this was a private matter. He maintained that the letter from the premier and from the agent of the government were requests for the interference of a foreign power in a public question. It was no answer to questions on this public subject to say that a letter had been stolen, or to charge Senator Landry with improperly obtaining possession of a copy. But if such a charge was made it was the right of the person accused to have it investigated. Sir Mackenzie understood that this correspondence was not so secret after all, as the letter in question had appeared in print in a pamphlet printed in Rome containing an account of what happened on the school question.

It seems to be the view of the ministers that these letters and negotiations of theirs are sufficiently public to be used where they can do the most political service, but that they ought not to be used where the exposure might be to the disadvantage of the ministry.

The adjournment of the bogus prosecution enquiry is a triumph for Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. Mr. Sifton having distributed something like $20,000 of public money, to prosecute conservatives whom he could not find guilty, tried to get a vindication of his conduct before the particulars of the financial transaction could be ascertained. As the department of justice seemed to know nothing about this steal until it was too late to stop it, when Sir Oliver Mowat is said to have declared that the accounts were "damnable," Mr. Howell, who got part of the money and distributed the rest, was sent for. He has given a very loose account of his financial transactions, which appear to include accommodation drafts and all sorts of bills that he could not explain. But Mr. Sifton took three or four days gathering from Mr. Howell a list and details of the crimes which he said were committed by the wicked tories of Manitoba. These were the crimes which Mr. Howell tried to prove on the spot and met only failure. But he told of them glibly enough, and the committee was supposed to have accepted as hard facts all the charges that the Manitoba juries had contemptuously thrown out. Mr. Howell unfortunately left in Manitoba many of the papers he was asked to bring, and those which he brought he discovered were confidential when he got them here. So he could sit in the committee and state what some fellow told him about a returning officer and have it accepted, though he held in his hand his own notes stating that the informant was a notorious liar. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper made things rather uncomfortable for Mr. Howell about his notes of evidence, from which he could read such choice extracts as he pleased, but which he could not allow any of the committee to see. On the whole Mr. Howell was one of the most unsatisfactory witnesses who ever appeared before a committee of the house.

The committee has not been able to get the other witnesses, and the case will have to be continued next session. But the ministers appeared yesterday in force, and insisted that on the evidence of Howell alone, who pocketed several thousands of dollars, the committee should report that the government had done right in employing him. Sir Charles Hibbert did not ask the committee to condemn the government. He only asked that judgment should be suspended until the trial was over. But the government was there with a majority at its back and was bound to use it. The majority would listen to nothing but the statement that Sifton must be vindicated. While it seems certain that no minister needs vindication more than Mr. Sifton, it struck the opposition that no man was in a worse position to claim it. Least of all was Sir Charles Hibbert disposed to be brow-beaten and bullied by men of the stamp of Mulock and Lister. Mr. McMullen lacks the commanding appearance and dignified tone which compels order, and for an hour or two there was a pretty hot time. At one stage Dr. Sproule was claiming the floor when Mr. Lister undertook to divide the space with him. The two were standing face to face within easy reach of each other. Mr. McMullen was heard to be signifying in a complaining tone a desire for order, and other members were shouting "order," so that the spicy altercation between the two Ontario members was hardly intelligible. Terrible things may have been said, but they will never be on record. Dr. Sproule, however, held the fort.

So in the end did Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper. Whether it was bluff or whether it was serious does not matter, but he gave the government to understand that if they insisted on passing judgment this session the session would not be ended until the evidence was all in. Mr. Mulock, who had tried to control the situation, has on several occasions discovered the impossibility of doing business in the face of an opposition which does not want this kind of business to be done. He knew that what Sir Charles Hibbert and Mr. Wood, Dr. Sproule and the others undertook to do in the way of prolonging the session they could accomplish. So he backed down. The judgment of the committee is not passed, and there will be other witnesses on the Manitoba bogus prosecutions besides the persons who instituted them and who got the $16,000.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, June 6.—The Montreal Witness is a journal whose devotion to the liberal party is not even exceeded by its devotion to public morality. Therefore it seems reasonable that Mr. Foster should make use of its observations concerning the Montreal harbor deal. Parliament has at times made advances to the harbor commissioners of Montreal. Interest has been regularly paid on these advances, and it is proposed now to guarantee a loan for additional wharf accommodation. But the government has imposed a condition on these guarantees that the harbor works executed under them shall be subject to the approval of the minister of public works. Now the minister of public works is Mr. Tarte, and Mr. Tarte gives a large application to his power of review. The purpose of the proviso was that the expenditure should not be such as to imperil the dominion claim for interest. But Mr. Tarte does not take that view of it. He insists that the whole plan shall virtually be made by him. He interposed objections and placed his veto on the plan approved by the harbor board, the board of trade and the shipping men of Montreal. And today he insists that of the proposed expenditure under the guarantee three-quarters of a million shall be expended in improvements in the eastern part of the town.

The shipping men and the harbor board and all the interests chiefly concerned do not want to make such appropriation. The city of Montreal and its trade has to pay the bills, and the authorities there do not want to incur expenditure that they think can give no return for the money paid out. The opinion of the board of trade in these matters is set out in the report of last year.

Now it is understood that certain influential parties having the sympathy of Mr. Tarte are interested in property at the east end of the city, and that the veto of Mr. Tarte is largely for their financial advantage. This is the charge made by the Montreal Witness which Mr. Foster read the other day. The Witness speaks of "Mr. Tarte's political job," and insists that the city should refuse to have anything to do with it, even though the guarantee be withdrawn. It claims that the city will do better to borrow money on its own credit than to use the dominion credit to get money, nearly half of which Mr. Tarte is compelling them to throw away. The Witness says: "There is financial authority for the statement that the harbor commission could borrow all they need at 3 1-2 per cent. A loan of a million and a quarter at 3 1-2 per cent. is more economical than a loan of two million at 3 per cent., three-quarters of a million of which would not be expended economically." And again it says: "Mr. Tarte and Mr. Prefontaine are in such haste in rushing through their political job that they asked the harbor commission to commit itself to a project for which no site had been chosen, for which there was no plan, the cost of which has not been estimated, and the commission is asked to bind itself to proceed with the expenditure upon this unplanned, unconsidered work as fast as it proceeds in the central portion of the harbor, which has been demanded, considered and planned and even half executed during the last fifteen or twenty years. There is one thing that was made very plain yesterday, and that is that the government as a whole has not required that the commission should commit itself to the dock's jobbery. We should judge from Mr. Bickerdike's statement that the premier and the minister of agriculture were opposed to the job, and that Mr. Tarte alone in the government is trying to force the job through."

Mr. Bickerdike, who is also a liberal and an M. P. P., was one of the delegates to meet the government to talk over the subject. He reported that the minister of agriculture himself had said that he considered the commissioners should be free to spend the money where it would be of the greatest benefit to the port. All these matters Mr. Foster brought up when the harbor bill was before the house. Mr. Tarte grew indignant at the quotations from the Witness. He declared that the Witness had treated him in a "shamefully abusive" manner and was grossly unfair. He denied that he had a dollar's interest in the property which was to be used by his command, though no one said he had. He could not deny that his friends had a large interest in it, and if he had denied it his statement would probably have been accepted with incredulity, in view of a recent concession of his own. A few weeks ago Mr. Tarte on oath declared that he had not told the whole truth in regard to Mr. Greenshields and the purchase of the Tarte organ in Montreal, because if he told the facts the tory press would lie about him. Mr. Tarte professes to tell the truth in regard to this job, but now we never know how much he is withholding in order to preserve the integrity of the tory press.

The story repeated by the Witness that a fine quarrel took place when the delegation from Montreal met some of the ministers in a conference over this transaction seems to be true enough. There were present at that meeting Mr. Tarte, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Dobell of the government, Mr. Bickerdike of the harbor commission, and one or two of the Montreal members of parliament. The report states that Mr. Tarte insisted that the east end of Montreal should be considered because it was inhabited by the French-Canadian element. Mr. Fisher put in his word in favor of allowing the Montreal authorities to improve their harbor in their own way. Mr. Tarte attacked him in vigorous language. "It is fanaticism," said Mr. Tarte, "nothing but fanaticism which prevents you from rendering justice to the French-Canadians whom I represent in the Laurier government, and who nevertheless strongly supported you in Brome. But for them you would not be a minister or a member, and if today you are a member and a minister, you owe it to the French-Canadians. Unfortunately you forget it." Later in the conference Mr. Tarte is said to have addressed himself to the French-Canadians present with these remarks: "This, gentlemen, is an example of the fight which I have to make every day