

wanted to win—of course, as a party man—but, above all, whether the House will take it from me or not, for the sake of the cause that was then at stake and at issue. My position was clear and well defined; and I was met how? I was met by the statement that it was cowardly for me to pretend that that was an issue; that there could be no dispute between the two parties in regard to that question; that the Roman Catholic Laurier—if he will pardon me for using the language of the hustings—would be as true to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba as the Orangeman Bowell. And that speech of the leader of the Opposition of 1893 was read to me by the hon. member for Guysboro' to prove on that question the leader of the Opposition was as ready to do justice to the minority in Manitoba, as the leader of this Government; and so thought the candidate himself. Then they charged me with cowardice because, as they said, I sought to get away from the real issues of scandals and trade, to capture a verdict in the county of Antigonish, on the assumption that there was any difference between the two great parties in Canada on this question. I was beaten—beaten in an old Reform constituency; but I congratulated myself on the fact that the hon. member for Guysboro' and the man who was afterwards elected the member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) were as honestly and firmly pledged to the policy of remedial legislation as I was. Yet the other night I listened to no less than four objections from the hon. member for Guysboro' to the policy of remedial legislation. I heard with dismay and chagrin that there could be a member from the province of Nova Scotia ready to urge one, two, three or four objections to a policy of this character. Let us see what the issue was in that campaign; let us wait to see how the hon. member for Antigonish acts or votes; and let us remember at the same time that his assistant, the man who did more than any one else to bring him successfully through that fight, was the hon. member for Guysboro'. This was the platform I met. It is the hon. gentleman's own address at a public meeting held in Antigonish on the 6th of April, and reported in the "Morning Chronicle," the Grit paper in Halifax, on the 5th of April, 1895, shortly before the election:

He would dismiss the Manitoba school question by the remark that the rights of the minority of Manitoba were at least as safe in the hands of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal party, including Colin F. McIsaac, as in the hands of Mackenzie Bowell, ex-Grand Master of the Orange Order, and Joseph A. Chisholm.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt that hon gentlemen opposite by their loud "hear, hear," desire to drown the reference to the miserable, the almost rascally appeal to the electorate against the ex-Grand Master.

That might have been the excitable language of an excited individual on the hustings; but let us take the hon. gentleman's written address to the electors. This is what the member for Antigonish wrote on April 10 to the electors of that county:

As to the Manitoba school difficulty, I am in full sympathy with the Catholic minority. Between myself and my opponent on this question there is no difference of opinion. We both agree that full and ample justice should and must be done to our co-religionists in Manitoba. I pledge myself, if elected, to support remedial legislation.

Where is the cheer now? Gentlemen on the opposite cheered the previous quotation; will they deny me a cheer now? In pity, I ask, will the member for Antigonish deny me a cheer? But the hon. gentleman said more:

It is not, as has been truly remarked, a question of Government and Opposition, nor of Protestant and Catholic. It is one of constitutional action and general rights. But members of the Government and their supporters in this county claim great credit for the Government's action in passing the Order in Council. The Government have, however, done only what they were bound to do under the constitution, and in obedience to the command of the highest judicial authority in the realm.

Oh, how often, Mr. Speaker, I have seen my hon. friends opposite laugh, as members on this side of the House dwelt on the importance of those words, the highest judicial authority in the realm. Here we bring them face to face with the language of one of their ardent colleagues. He goes on.

No. Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, the Minister of Justice, who admits he is opposed to separate schools, has stated that should the Manitoba Government refuse remedial legislation, then the Parliament of Canada, not the Government, will be called upon to deal with the matter. And in that Parliament, can you not as safely trust the rights and interests of the Catholic minority to Laurier, the Liberal members of Parliament, and myself, as to Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Conservative members of Parliament, and Mr. Joseph A. Chisholm? In his card to the electors of the county, Mr. Chisholm intimates that Laurier has failed to declare his policy on the school question. This, however, is not so. He has already declared himself in favour of the Catholic minority.

I count upon the support of the hon. member for Antigonish. In decency and in common fair-play, he must vote for remedial legislation, after winning a verdict upon that address. But I refer to him only to contrast his position with that of the hon. member for Guysboro', who is going to vote against this Bill, and who is responsible more than any other man for the presence of the hon. member for Antigonish in Parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I counted sincerely, when we came to this difficult stage of this question, on the support of the leader of the Opposition. I am glad to see him in his place to-day—glad on every account; glad, particularly, that he has survived the attack of illness from which he has suffered from