

ments made by the hon. member for L'Islet, that I should have the opportunity of denying that accusation. I never made such declarations, and if the ex-Minister of Justice made in Cardwell the statement attributed to him, he made an assertion that was entirely wrong and inaccurate. There was no necessity for making such an appeal on the occasion referred to. What were the facts? We witnessed a delightful scene in the town of Lachine on that memorable evening. We had with us the present ex-Minister of Justice, who was then Minister of Justice. We had also the present Minister of Public Works. The ex-Minister of Justice opened the meeting by stating the position of the Government in regard to its policy on the Manitoba school question. He said, come what might, no matter what might arise, the Government would adhere to its policy of remedial legislation. It mattered not what difficulties might arise. It mattered not what might transpire, the policy of remedial legislation would be brought before this House, and if necessary the Government would fall by it or triumph by it. I look to-night at the gentleman who was then Minister of Justice, and I have every reason to ask him, is it his intention to have remedial legislation passed? Mr. Speaker, not only during the late recess of Parliament, but during the last five years, we have made the charge that the Government never intended doing justice to the minority in Manitoba. What are the facts? Those representing the Catholic minority of Manitoba, when the legislation of 1890 had been passed asked this Government to disallow these Acts of which they complained. The Government of that time did nothing. It is true an election was coming along and the impression was circulated throughout the province of Quebec that the law would be disallowed, whereas in the province of Ontario an entirely different impression was created by the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen supporting the Administration. The elections passed and the Catholic people of Manitoba had been humbugged. They were advised to go from court to court until finally they obtained a verdict in their favour from the highest tribunal in the land. Then it was that this Government assured them that in obedience to the judgment there delivered, justice would be done. This session was called for the purpose of doing justice to the Catholic minority of Manitoba by the Government of the day. It was not called for the purpose of showing what conspiracies could exist and did exist within the ranks of the Government, but simply for the purpose of righting what they claimed, and what I claim to have been a great wrong. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was there ever such a wrong perpetrated upon any people as that which has been perpetrated by the ex-Minister of Justice and his bolting colleagues upon the Catholic people of the

province of Quebec? Why was it that they put that speech in the mouth of His Excellency when they knew that they were about to bolt? Why is it that they advised His Excellency to call this Parliament together for the purpose of passing a great act of legislation when they knew perfectly well that they had not the slightest intention of passing that Act? Why is it that they called Parliament together, bringing members from every part of Canada, simply to trifle with them as they have been doing during the last four days? Why is it that they trifle as they have been doing with that large class of the community having business with the Parliament of Canada? Is Parliament simply to be a witness to the antagonism which exists among members of the Administration? We are here, representatives of the people, in response to the call of His Excellency, anxious to transact the business for which Parliament was called, and what do we find? We find that the gentlemen who advised His Excellency to call Parliament together know not what their own mind is, and know not for what purpose they did call Parliament together. This, Sir, is perhaps as sad a condition of affairs as can be found anywhere. I would like to ask the present Minister of Public Works, if he could stand upon the floor of Parliament to-day, as I saw him stand up at Lachine a few days ago, and thank the ex-Minister of Justice for his attitude on the question of remedial legislation? Only two weeks ago the Minister of Public Works stood before a large audience in the town of Lachine and gave his thanks in most profuse language to the ex-Minister of Justice for his noble stand, for his spirit of generosity to the Catholic minority, and for the fact that he was ready to sacrifice his political life to uphold the principles of the constitution. I ask the Minister of Public Works to stand up to-day in the Parliament of Canada and to repeat those thanks to his late colleague the ex-Minister of Justice. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ouimet) to-day thank the ex-Minister of Justice for what he has done for the Catholic minority? This is the place and this is the time, if such thanks can be given with any degree of sincerity. I can understand what the confusion of the Minister of Public Works must be now. I believe in my heart that the Minister of Public Works thought that night, that the Minister of Justice was sincere, and I sympathize with him in the downfall of his hopes and of his aspirations. Mr. Speaker, I simply rose for the purpose of correcting the impression which had been created by the speech of the ex-Minister of Justice in Cardwell. No, Sir; not in Montreal Centre, and not in the county of Jacques Cartier did we make appeals to feelings of race and religion. Our opponents did that. Our opponents conducted in Montreal Centre the most despicable campaign which was ever