

right to make such a statement. In the first place, he was not speaking in the name of the Conservative party. The Conservative party is not composed of seven men, or even ten or twelve. The Conservative party is composed of the members of the House now sitting here. Are the members of the Conservative party in the House in a position to give their opinion to-day? Are they prepared to stand up in their places, and to take a vote, and to advise His Excellency in the choice he should make? None of those hon. gentlemen would dare to do it. The ex-leader of the House has made an undignified statement, as it has been qualified by his leader, an unconstitutional statement. Sir, we are face to face with a grave crisis. What I have said is perfectly true. The members who have gone out of the Administration happen to be Protestants, and nearly all the members which have remained faithful to the Prime Minister are Roman Catholics. That fact cannot be ignored, and the members of the Administration who have gone out must bear in history the responsibility of having divided this country on religious lines. I hope their scheme will not succeed, and I do not say so for the sake of my party. We are prepared to defeat hon. gentlemen opposite in the open field. Montreal Centre and Jacques Cartier have given the keynote. Let hon. gentlemen opposite dissolve the House, and instead of knifing their friends let them come into the open field, and they will be defeated. But I beg of them, because I belong to the minority, not to divide this country on religious lines. When there was a crisis in this House last year three Roman Catholic members of the Cabinet went out of the Administration. Two of them subsequently returned; and what did they say? They told the House that during this session a remedial law would be introduced. The same pledge given either verbally or in writing has been circulated from one bishop's palace to another in the province of Quebec. I and my Liberal colleagues have been accused of being traitors to our race and our religion. Accused by whom? By Ministers of the Crown and by their organs. And now to-day we are face to face, I repeat, with a party divided on religious lines. I did not intend to take any part in this debate; but when I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) speaking of the Conservative party, constituted as it is to-day, as the only party which could be loyal and which could govern Canada, I said to myself that it was time that in the name of my electors, I should rise and declare that the Conservative party as it is to-day is surely not the party to which some of us belonged not very long ago. Under Sir John A. Macdonald was there ever such a shameful crisis as the one with which we are now face to face? Under Sir John Thompson was

Mr. TARTE.

there anything like it? Under Sir George E. Cartier did anything of this kind occur? What do we see to-day? That party which believes itself to be the only one capable of governing Canada, is unable to find among its members in both Houses a man who can be placed at the head of affairs, and that party is trying to impose on His Excellency a man who is not supposed to be here. The High Commissioner is not supposed to be in this country, but he is supposed to be at his post. By what right is the leader of the Government or any member of the Conservative party entitled to impose upon His Excellency a man who is not even a member of either House. I resume my seat expressing the hope that the country will be taught a lesson by this crisis, and that the people will learn to watch their rulers with the greatest care. In this aspect of the case I quite agree with my hon. friend before me (Mr. Davin). Members of the Conservative party during the past years have forgotten that they were representing the people, and I know there are in the country thousands of Conservatives who are to-day rallying around the banner of my hon. friend because they did not find on the other side of the House that security which existed in past days.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not rise for the purpose of taking any extensive part in the debate that has arisen on the motion for adjournment, but I desire simply to correct an impression which has been created by a recent discourse of the ex-Minister of Justice. I rise in view of the statement just made by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte) in regard to appeals made to the feelings of race and of creed. It is true, I attended a meeting in the town of Lachine at which the ex-Minister of Justice was present. I had the pleasure of listening to his able discourse on that occasion, and I was led to reply to a few points made by him. But the ex-Minister of Justice will bear me out in this statement, that on that occasion I never said a single word against the present Premier of Canada because of his having been connected with the Orange order, nor a single word in favour of my leader in this House because of the fact that he is of Catholic allegiance and of French birth. I did not do so, and the ex-Minister of Justice knows it perfectly well. Nevertheless, if I am to believe what has appeared in the newspapers, on the very day following the Minister of Justice, speaking in a constituency in which the majority of the electors belong to a religion and race entirely different from the electors whom he addressed in Lachine, stated that Mr. Brodeur and Mr. Devlin made appeals when in the province of Quebec based on the racial origin and faith of their leader and declared against the Premier because of the fact that he was an Orangeman. I think it is only proper in view of the state-