

Let us prove ourselves now, in the thirtieth year of our existence, as in the stress of our natal days, a people fit for empire, and worthy to rank amongst the best and greatest of nations.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the words of the hon. member for North Toronto. He was here in 1896, after the election, and after the government of which he had been a member was defeated. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) stated last night that Sir Charles Tupper, the then leader of that party, at that time in opposition, with the hon. member North Toronto sitting at his side, declared that he was still prepared to pass a remedial Bill, and called on this government to pass one. The Hon. George Eulas Foster sat at his side and endorsed that declaration, so that he had not then experienced a change of heart, and, so far as that parliament was concerned, I suppose he was bound by those speeches. Now, what does the hon. gentleman say in 1905? Here are his words:

I regret in no single jot or tittle my act in 1896. Under similar circumstances, I would do the same thing, but I do not at all say that I will ever do the same thing under the circumstances that may arise after this. Why? Because there is a power which after all is mightier than the constitution. We invoked the constitution in 1896. We tried to give it its full force in a clear case and we were prevented by the leader of a great party. After we were prevented, that leader and his party went to the people in 1896, 1900 and 1904, and the people declared that they did not want remedial legislation. In the interests of the 41 per cent which has been talked about in this House, in the interests of the province of Quebec which was specially interested, we on this side tried to get for the minority their rights in the only way we possibly could under the constitution. We were prevented from doing it by the Liberal party, and during three successive elections the Liberal party have endorsed the policy; we want no hands laid on any province even though it deprives the minority of that province of the rights guaranteed it under the constitution. And I make bold to say that as long as grass grows and water runs, I do not feel disposed to go against that will three times expressed of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Toronto asked the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) to withdraw the statement when he said that the hon. gentleman had changed his views because it did not pay. I am sorry that the hon. member for North Toronto is not here, because I would like to ask him two questions. He says that on three successive occasions the Conservative party endeavoured to sustain remedial legislation, that in 1896 they were defeated, that in 1900 they were defeated, and that in 1904 they were defeated. I do not know anything about the hon. gentleman's election of 1900, but I will ask him to say whether in the constituency of North Toronto in 1904 he ran on the coercion plat-

form that he occupied in 1896. Does he say that he asked the electors of North Toronto to support his coercion policy of 1896? He dare not make such a statement. It is a mere method which he takes to crawl out of the principles he then enunciated. I do not know what the hon. gentleman may hope for, but I do not think the public will be blind to what he has said. In one of his speeches the hon. gentleman remarked: 'You have to be honest or the public will get on to you.' Well, he must think that they are a pretty blind public if they do not get on to him on this question.

I do not believe—and I am a constituent of the hon. gentleman, I live in North Toronto—that North Toronto will think the better of him for what he has done. The people of that constituency may feel that on their altar he is prepared to sacrifice all his past principles and all his past record, but whether North Toronto will feel that by that sacrifice they have been compensated for providing him with a haven of rest after his wanderings in this cold, cold political world for four years, I leave them to say, as possibly they may have another chance to say. Probably it has been evident from the way I have discussed this question that there is to-day a certain feeling of triumph in my breast for having lived to see the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the colleagues who were here with him prior to 1896, who denounced Dalton McCarthy for expressing these views, to-day standing up enunciating and supporting them. There is but this one question left: On the language question, the views of Mr. Dalton McCarthy have been adopted, and so have his views on the school question in Manitoba. We have just this one question left, and if we do not prevail to-day we have the pleasure of knowing that those who most loudly denounced him are now enunciating the same views as he enunciated. I make no apology for speaking thus in regard to the hon. member for North Toronto. I believe I am justified in doing so, and I say further that so far as this speech discloses hypocrisy and apostasy, it can do no harm. I had expected to see the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) at the conclusion of the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) rise and congratulate him and accept him as an acquisition. He did not do it, although he was kind enough to do that when I pronounced myself. I did see, or I imagined I saw, rather a smile of satisfaction flit across the face of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). He went through it in 1896, he was jeered at, he was sneered at, he was almost read out of his party because he dared to enunciate these same views, and he was silently able to look at the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), squirming in his endeavor to rid himself

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY.