

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) having made a straight statement, he must be replied to by me, or I am in danger of being held to acquiesce in that statement.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman wishes to ask a question—

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I deny absolutely what the hon. gentleman stated in his last sentence, and I ask him to withdraw it and give me the credit I demand for sincerity in the statement I made.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the rules of debate require that a member of this House must accept the denial of another member on a personal matter.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all I want.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. And I change my own to this: I say that the Tupper administration of which Mr. Foster was a member, were endeavouring to force through this House a Bill to coerce the province of Manitoba at the request and under the dictation of the hierarchy of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. That also I deny.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) denies that, but I am not obliged to withdraw my statement. I will stand by it, as I have always stood by it; and I leave it to a discriminating public to judge whether it is true or not.

An hon. MEMBER. You stand all alone.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Well, it is not the first time that a McCarthy has stood alone in this House; and, please God, if necessary, it will not be the last. I say that, in 1896—and hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to like me to get too close to that—we found the state of affairs that I have spoken of. And here is the peculiarity of the situation. In that year, we found the hon. gentlemen who are now in opposition in close alliance with the bishops of the church of the province of Quebec. It became necessary, apparently, if justice was to be done, for the Papal power to be asked to interfere. If we are to believe what we have heard within the last two days, the Papal delegate came to settle some difficulties—and unquestionably they were difficulties with regard to political affairs,—between the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and their bishops. If the Papal delegate is interfering I declare his action is highly improper and I denounce it. But, I want this House and country to understand that if the respective parties expect to make capital out of it, their whole record on the subject should be considered. Take the history of Canada from confederation down to the present day, and how many members have ever stood up to vote squarely on an issue of this kind? Twenty-one, I believe, is the

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY.

largest number that ever united to prevent such encroachments as these, in regard to which, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would lead us to believe, he was so sincere in protesting. If so it is the first time in twenty-three years that he has so spoken.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I do not know that I need say much in reply to the hon. member (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) who has just taken his seat. That hon. gentleman has displayed his political stock in trade. I think the House and the country will acknowledge that the late Dalton McCarthy was a man of considerable eminence both at the bar and in this House. His record is history. But I do not know that anybody would venture to express a belief that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) will ever be noticed in history. The hon. gentleman spoke at a meeting in Toronto a short time ago, and was then very boastful of his Protestantism and of the Protestantism of his family before him. He told the people assembled on that occasion that the cry of equal rights and opposition to French domination in Canada was the cry he had always raised in North Simcoe; that on that policy he had nailed his colours to the mast and would stand or fall by them. There was a contest last fall in North Simcoe, as there was in the rest of the Dominion, and I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a scintilla of proof that he even opened his mouth upon the equal rights question or any such question as he has dealt with before the House to-day.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that I made no such statement in Toronto as that he has attributed to me as to this question been in issue in my campaign last election. I stated that in the first and second campaigns it was an issue. But, if the hon. gentleman wants to know I can tell him that I can produce evidence that I stated at Hawkestone, in the township of Oro, that I was certain that when the Bill for the granting of autonomy to the Northwest came up, the school question would again arise.

Mr. BENNETT. I took occasion to look up the file of a Collingwood newspaper devoted to the government, and, it will be apparent to any body reading that newspaper that the great issue in North Simcoe last election was whether or not the Collingwood harbour should have the benefit of a large grant of government money. And that was the whole question. As to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. L. G. McCarthy's) political stock in trade in that riding, I can tell the House that it does not carry the people as his late uncle used to do. In the township of Vespra the late Dalton McCarthy used to get a majority of about one hundred; the hon. member (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) was in a minority of thirty in the last election.