

some nest in which he might sit and from which he might descant upon the decay of political virtue in Canada. At last he has found, in an adjoining constituency to that of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), a place that was willing to take him in. And, coming back to the political arena once more, he proceeds, absolutely oblivious to the past record. Like the ostrich he puts his head in the sand and fancies that no one sees what is going on. Metaphorically he has put his head in the sand and says to the people of Canada: Do not look at my history previous to 1900, but gaze on this apostle of virtue, this George Eulas Foster, who has come to life again. My hon. friend who descanted upon this question so glibly was a leading member of the former government of this country. He talks about Italian prelates who are going to take tithes from interference in the political affairs of this country. He talks with great glibness, with a great deal of energy but my hon. friend was the associate of gentlemen who were very glad not so many years ago to look to these gentlemen for aid and comfort and were fanning the flames of religious discord—only they were doing business from the other end of the line. What do we find they were doing in those days? The history is embalmed in the records of our courts. I refer the hon. gentleman who is looking for data on which to discuss matters likely to give rise to discord not to take hearsay statements from buccaneer politicians but to look at the Supreme Court reports of the Dominion of Canada. What do we find that the associates of my hon. friend who descants on political virtue to-day were doing in the past when he blossomed and flourished as a minister of the Crown? We find in evidence here that in those days some of the clergy in the province of Quebec discussed political questions in this way:

You know in what manner the serpent found his way into the terrestrial paradise, with what cunning he succeeded in convincing Eve that she should not die, nor Adam either, by eating of the forbidden fruit. You all know what took place; the serpent was the cause of the misfortunes that are weighing upon us. In the same manner Catholic Liberalism wishes to find its way into the paradise of the church to lead her children to fall. Be firm, my brethren, our bishops tell us that it is no longer permitted to be conscientiously a Catholic Liberal; be careful never to taste the fruit of the tree Catholic Liberal.

These are the injunctions of the friends of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in days gone by. Let me give you another quotation from the same case to show how delightfully consistent he is, how lovely my hon. friend from North Toronto has been, and what a splendid record he has upon this question. What do we find?

Now, if sometimes it is sinful to vote in a certain way, rather than in another way,

Mr. MACDONALD.

it cannot be, assuredly, when you are voting according to the wise counsels of all the bishops of the province; and if it is not in that way, it must be in the opposite. However, I must tell you that if you are voting for a Liberal candidate, not believing him to be so, because your conscience tells you that he is the man that will best represent your interests in parliament, in such case you do not sin. But if you know that he is a Liberal, you cannot conscientiously give him your vote; you are sinning by favouring a man who supports principles condemned by the church, and you assume the responsibility of the evil which that candidate may do in the application of the dangerous principles which he professes.

Let me say further that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and I regret that he is not here—was engaged in other political matters in this country in 1896 which touched on religious matters and fanning the flames of religious discord was a favourite occupation of the hon. gentleman and his friends in those days. What do we find was the battle cry of our Conservative friends in 1896 in Quebec and other places in this country? We find that they were aware of and assented to the issuing of a mandement dealing with the question of how people should vote. In a sermon of Bishop Lafleche in 1896, after quoting the latter part of the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the bishop added:

In the circumstances, a Catholic could not without making a mortal sin vote for the leader of the party who has made such a statement (referring to Sir Wilfrid's speech) and for the partisans who support him so long as they will not have publicly repudiated that error and taken the engagement to vote for a remedial law approved by the bishops.

This is the record of the member for North Toronto in 1896, a record which he would fain forget. And of course he tells us to-day that as long as the grass grows and water runs he is not going to do the like again. The only difference now is that while he is trying to carry on the same game he is now trying to work upon the Protestants of this country instead of on our Roman Catholic friends. And he tells us he is not going to do this again because he was beaten, forsooth, in 1896 and in 1900 and in 1904. That is not the Spartan-like virtue of the old heroes who when they fell down got up again. He is perfectly willing to desert the cause which did not give him office or bring him satisfactory results. There is only one thing to be said with regard to my hon. friend and it is this that the men who sit behind him, that the Conservative party in this country found him out four years ago. Down in New Brunswick, they knew him right along and this year when the opportunity came to these men, when he had been for twenty years in political life, to advance him to a position of honour and leadership in that party, they knew him so well that they would not trust him, hence it is son of my own province sits him, hence it is a son of my own province sits