

intelligent reasoning capacity, who would justify himself, or would justify himself to his country, if he oppressed a feeble minority, and that for the purpose of bringing into power a Roman Catholic French Premier, who declares he will do more.

"A Roman Catholic French Premier." The hon. gentleman was speaking in the city of Winnipeg, to an English-speaking audience. He was addressing his friends, as he said—his English-speaking friends in Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba where the great bulk of the people are opposed to intervention in this matter. If he wanted to make a point against me by saying I had promised to do more than his Bill provided, why, in the name of common sense, was he so particular to tell them that if they turned him out of power they would bring into office a "French Canadian Roman Catholic Premier." There was inuendo in that. He disclaims having had any intention of appealing to sectional or race or religious prejudice. A few days afterwards the hon. gentleman was at Port Arthur and this is the language he made use of there:

I am speaking now not to Liberals—it is no use speaking to them, but to Conservatives, and ask can you vote to turn out the present Government and put in a French Roman Catholic Premier.

If that was not an appeal to race and religion, what is the use of language? But the hon. gentleman went to the province of Quebec. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that he used in the province of Quebec the same language that he used in Winnipeg or Port Arthur? Here I have the speech he made in Montreal, at Sohmer Park, before a French-speaking audience. I quote from the report of the Montreal "Gazette":

I am prepared to say that what I said at Winnipeg was this:

Now, mark the words. The hon. gentleman was explaining to a French Canadian and Roman Catholic audience what he stated at Winnipeg, which language I have just quoted.

I made an appeal to the Liberal Conservative electors who were under the impression that the Dominion Government was forcing separate schools upon the province of Manitoba. I said, "Is there a man of intelligence here who does not see that the Government are only carrying out the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Queen's Privy Council, a judgment which declares that the privileges which belonged to the Roman Catholic minority have been taken away, and that it is the duty of the Parliament of Canada to restore those privileges." I took the ground that every Liberal Conservative was in honour bound to stand by his party in endeavouring to restore the privileges of which a feeble Roman Catholic minority had been robbed, instead of striking down that party for the purpose of bringing into power a French Roman Catholic Premier who himself had declared that he had opposed the Bill because—

He promised more? No, but because—

—it was too weak to accomplish its object.

Here is the language of the hon. gentleman

in Winnipeg. Speaking to English Protestants his language is: Are you going to turn us out and bring into power a French Roman Catholic Premier who promises that he will do more? But in Quebec he says: Are you going to turn us out of power and put into office a French Canadian Roman Catholic Premier who declares the Bill is too weak, and that he will bring in a stronger Bill? There is the language of the hon. gentleman—an appeal to prejudice on both occasions, an appeal to the French Canadians because I had opposed this Bill on the ground that it was too weak; and an appeal to the Protestant and English-speaking electors of Manitoba because I had opposed the Bill on the ground that I desired to bring in a stronger one. Sir, on each occasion the hon. gentleman was doing his very best in order to arouse local prejudices in each province. Now, to-day, to crown all, the hon. gentleman is sending the whip of the party into an important constituency to tell the people that they are not to vote for Mr. Paterson because a vote for Mr. Paterson would be a vote in favour of Quebec rule and French domination. French domination! Sir, this is the time and the day to clear up that issue. This is the time and the day, I insist upon it. Let us deal with this question now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that I disclaim having sent any person to make any such statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sir, to-morrow is polling day; it is only too bad that this declaration of the hon. gentleman was not made eight days ago. French domination! No person has a right to speak of French domination. It is true that we carried the province of Quebec; but there is no question of French domination, or English domination, or Irish domination, or Scotch domination, or German domination. We stand on British Canadian citizenship. What matters it, Sir, whether the majority supporting the Government come from one province or another if the policy of the Government rests upon the broad principles of truth, justice and honour? What matters it whether the majority comes from one province or another if the arguments we used in one province were those we used in all the provinces? Sir, the men who to-day occupy these benches are fully conscious that upon this and upon other matters they have before them difficult and anxious questions to deal with and to settle, not by appealing to one class, not by appealing to one section; but upon all questions and on all occasions, by appealing to all classes, and to all sections, with the view and with the end, with the supreme view and with the supreme end of making Canada a country, not a country only, but one country as well.

Mr. FOSTER. Unaccustomed as we are to our respective places, and being new in