

conciliation should be used, yet when he found himself face to face with his own constituents in the province of Quebec, he propounded a new and entirely different doctrine from that on which the issue had been fairly and squarely joined on the floor of this Parliament and before this country. And I will call the attention of this House for a few moments to the speech that the hon. gentleman made to his own constituents at St. Rochs. I am reading from a translation of an article that appeared in "Le Soir" which, I understand is an organ of very high authority with the hon. gentleman. The translation, which is a strictly literal one, of what was published in "Le Soir" of May 12, 1896, gives the statement the hon. gentleman made at St. Rochs :

If the people of Canada put me in power, as I am convinced they will, I will settle that question to the satisfaction of all interested parties. I will have with me Sir Oliver Mowat, who, with his popularity at stake, has always been, in Ontario, the champion of the Catholic minority and of separate schools. I will place him at the head of a commission which will look into all interests in jeopardy, and I assure you that I will succeed in according justice to those who are now suffering. Is not the very respected name of Mowat a guarantee of the success of this scheme? And lastly,—

And I invite the hon. gentleman's attention to this emphatic statement.

—should those means of conciliation fail, I shall have recourse to constitutional means, and these I will use fully and in their entirety.

What more could be said. Says "Le Soir":

Could any one bind oneself in a more solemn and straightforward manner?

He could not. And thus we see that the hon. gentleman who made a most emphatic appeal to this House against coercion, against overriding by this Parliament the act of a majority in the province of Manitoba, who went from platform to platform in the province of Ontario maintaining the same policy of non-interference, of avoiding anything like coercion and depending upon conciliation alone in order to obtain redress of those grievances, when standing in the presence of the electors of the province of Quebec placed himself not only on the same platform as the Government he opposed, but, in gambling parlance, he went one better than the late Government, and stated not only that he would adopt the same means as they adopted, that he would fall back upon the law and constitution of the country and by Act of this Parliament give the redress that Manitoba, if it proved obdurate, would not give—but that he would do it in its entirety. It is known very well that one of the charges the hon. gentleman made, and one of the charges most emphatically stated by a gentleman now a member of his Cabinet was that the measure proposed by the late Government fell altogether short of what was necessary in the inter-

ests of the minority. The leader of the present Government gave his pledge that he would use the constitutional remedy in its entirety and would go far beyond what the Liberal-Conservative party had proposed in this House to do. Now, I do not hesitate to say that a majority thus obtained, by the avoidance of a sharp issue clearly defined between two great parties when before the electorate of the country, is not a majority obtained by fair or legitimate and justifiable means. And, as I have shown, the hon. gentleman having obtained almost all his support he has outside the province of Quebec upon the policy of non-interference with the legislature of Manitoba, cannot turn round and obtain the support of the province of Quebec by a declaration that he will not only do that to which he has objected on the floor of this House and on the various platforms of Ontario, but that he will go much further than has been proposed by any other party in giving that redress and by the same constitutional means. I submit, therefore, that on that question the hon. gentleman is not at the head of a majority, but of a minority. Speaking on the authority of the First Minister, Mr. Monet, his candidate in Laprairie and Napierville, according to "La Patrie," of April 20th last, pledged himself to vote for no Remedial Bill unless it gives more advantages to the minority than were accorded in the famous Remedial Bill of last session. So the hon. gentleman sought the support of Quebec on a solemn and unequivocal pledge to carry out the policy of the Government to which he was opposed, and to go further in that direction than they proposed to go. And without that change of front in the face of the enemy, or of the electorate of this country, the hon. gentleman would still be sitting on this side of the House and not where he is. Now, Sir, I will make a short quotation from a speech which the hon. gentleman ventured to make at St. John's, in the province of Quebec, since the elections—a ministerial utterance. In that I find that he reverts again to his former position :

I have declared on the floor of the House of Commons, I have declared in Ontario, I have declared in Quebec—

I venture to question the accuracy of that portion—

—that the only means by which to settle this question was not by coercion, but by conciliation.

Since the elections are over, the hon. gentleman says he has declared on the floor of the House and in Ontario—about that there is no question, and in regard to it I agree with him—that he had emphatically declared that the only means—not a means, but the only means—by which this question could be settled was by conciliation and not