

on the manner in which these gentlemen are approached. He criticizes the government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell because they approached Mr. Greenway with a peremptory demand, instead of a polite request. He is not at all surprised that the provincial government refused to do justice to the minority, seeing a demand was peremptorily made that the law should be changed, accompanied with a threat of federal legislation in the event of refusal. "They passed an order-in-council," said Mr. Laurier, at the Renfrew meeting, "calling upon Manitoba to reverse her legislation, and threatening that if Manitoba failed to do it they would do it themselves." "Do you expect," he added, "that Manitoba was to be induced to reverse her course when she was not approached in a conciliatory manner, but when she was almost threatened at the point of the bayonet to do what she did not want to do? Manitoba's answer was, 'we will not be compelled'." . . . "If they had commenced with negotiations instead of threats, perhaps the matter would have been settled now." Again at Merrickville, he said: "He did not think that the government could hope that Mr. Greenway would give way under compulsion, but he might give way under conciliation." And again, at the same meeting, he said: "He believed with all his heart that as soon as the government abandoned the policy of coercion and threat and brag . . . and appealed to the people of Manitoba on the broad grounds of common Christianity, the people of the province would be not only just and fair, but generous to the meeting."

At his Morrisburg meeting Mr. Laurier referred to this feature of the question once more, and announced the manner in which he would have approached the local government if he had been in Sir Mackenzie Bowell's place. "I would approach this man Greenway," said he, "with the sunny ways of patriotism, asking him to be just and to be fair, asking him to be generous to the minority, in order that we may have peace amongst all the creeds and races which it has pleased God to bring upon this corner of our common country. Do you not believe there is more to be gained by appealing to the hearts and souls of men, rather than by trying to compel them to do a thing?"

What Mr. Laurier says may indeed be perfectly true. It is quite possible

that the persistent refusal of the provincial government to take a course that is just or fair or generous, to borrow the leader's expressive language, may have arisen from the manner in which they were approached on the subject, rather than from an objection, on principle, to making reasonable concessions. At the same time one can scarcely help feeling that it is somewhat unfortunate to have the settlement of so grave a question, involving possibly the very continuance of the federal union, dependent on a mere question of etiquette.

Mr. Laurier in the name of patriotism, and that we may have peace in this good land, would appeal to Mr. Greenway to be fair and just. The politeness of the Liberal chieftain restrains him from charging, in plain words, that the difficulty threatening the peace of the Dominion arise from the unfairness and injustice of the provincial administration, whose members like myself, are his own political followers. But just as plainly as if he had said it the necessary inference from his language is that Mr. Greenway has failed to be either just or fair on the question, that he has been both unfair and unjust to the minority, and that therefore, he and his colleagues are responsible for the continuance of the present unhappy situation. Mr. Laurier, not being in office cannot speak authoritatively on behalf of the federal powers, but speaking as an outsider—as the leader of the party in opposition—his meaning cannot be misunderstood, and his words plainly condemn the provincial government because they fail to relieve the difficulty by adopting that policy of conciliation, that principle of fairness and generosity for which Principal Grant and the Rev. Peter Wright pleaded. Mr. Laurier is a polished French gentleman who, with great intellectual power and ability, combines the most attractive personality, and the most perfect politeness. His strongest condemnation of his own political friends must be expressed in kindly phrase. Not so, however, with Mr. Joseph Martin, who is always ready to call a spade a spade. He does not hesitate to characterize the law that his political friends uphold, and that owes its very paternity to himself, as most unjust to Roman Catholics, and as being in fact, rank tyranny. These two gentlemen represent two widely different phases of character, but their statements practically lead to the same conclusion—that the

law is
After
scarcely
of Mr.
his la
some c
porter
And v
peace-
chieft
him, u
on the
Macke

If t
difficul
y qu
be ind
ermu
cial d
fore
der,
that
blunt
Engl
the c
ogy f
rior
an
the
that
Cana
for t
us in
Sir J
the c
much
by h
his l
Perh
is de
and
ing
tion

Th
the
sche
all c
Pea
don
loc
bro
in p
not
kin
by
Mr
bo
wo
an
giv
his
ter
no
th
ge
ell
th
to