

final extinguishment of all the substantial grievances of the Catholic people.

It but remains to add that during the general election of 1900, the attitude of the bishops of Quebec was without fault and beyond criticism. The struggle for a free voice and a free vote was won in 1896, and the name of Wilfrid Laurier must be for ever associated with the long contest and the final victory. Best of all, the devotion of the French Canadian people to their church stands unimpaired. There is no lessened acceptance of its beneficent faiths, there has no virtue departed from its ancient forms and ceremonies; the priest of God has authority undiminished in the realm of conduct and morals, while political freedom comports with the dignity and independence of the citizen, fulfils the requirements of the constitution, and conserves national stability. It is well, also, to remember that Monseigneur Conroy, Monseigneur Merry Del Val and Monseigneur Falconi, successive delegates from the Papal court, have passed condemnation upon the intolerant policy of the Quebec hierarchy, and upheld the rights of Canadian Catholics to all the constitutional privileges of British citizens.

Now, Mr. Willison has said in the Toronto 'News' that he does not believe there will be any power that can prevent the passage of this Bill in this House. In that, I believe, Mr. Willison is perfectly right. But he says further, that the proper thing for the people to do will be to keep up the agitation and to oppose, at the next election, the members who may support this Bill. He says: Some people may forget, but I promise I will not forget. I do not ask the people to forget. I ask them to remember; I ask them to remember everything; I ask them to remember all the circumstances. I ask the people, between now and the next election, to acquire all the information, all the knowledge they can respecting this subject. I ask them to give this question their careful, unbiased, honest, unprejudiced thought and consideration. I ask them, between now and the next election, to watch and see what shall be the effect in the country of this legislation. And then I ask them to vote as they may see fit, and, as they will have a right to do, whether it be for this government or against it. I ask the people, however, not to allow themselves to be stampeded by any crusade on the part of Tory papers in Toronto. I am perfectly willing to leave myself in the hands of the people, so far as I am concerned, there is no tribunal to which I would sooner go than to that of the people. But I do object to editors of Toronto papers assuming to be the advocate, the judge, the jury, the witness and the executioner. I have in my constituency a number of Orangemen and a number of Catholics. Some of the best friends I have, some of the best people I know, are members of the Orange society. Some of the best friends I have, some of the best people I know, are members of the Catholic Church. And, Sir, these people

at home, up in the South riding of Grey, Orange and Catholic, are living together in amity, associating together in friendship, doing business together and trusting each other, and no flame that can be kindled here, no passion that can be aroused will make those people look with hatred the one upon the other. Now before concluding I would like to refer for a moment to an article that appeared in the 'Christian Guardian' of the 29th of March last, under the heading of 'Expediency vs. Principle.' There is language in this article to which I object. I will read a paragraph from the earlier part of the article where it says:

We care not how many politicians from east or west may profess to be satisfied, or how many arguments may be brought forward to cover the retreat of those who fear personal loss or party lash, the fact remains that the principle of provincial rights—

And so on. I will read another sentence toward the end of the article which says:

Those of our readers who agree with us and have votes, should write to their representatives at once, and tell them that they will not support them again unless they cast their votes in parliament against all compromise and for the complete provincial independence of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Now, Sir, I say that there are in that article insinuations and threats that no man, whether he be a minister of the gospel or an editor of a newspaper, has a right to address to the people of this country, or to the members of this House, whether they be sitting on one side or the other. He speaks in the first place of members who profess to be satisfied, and yet are not satisfied, and by implication are not telling the truth, members who fear personal loss, or the party lash. Sir, I am not a very old member of this House, I have been a member of parliament for three months, but I will say that during all that time no question has arisen in this House, no legislation has been brought forward in relation to which any member of the cabinet, any party whip or any member of parliament has approached me to know how I would vote in one way or the other. I say that in this article in the 'Guardian' is the lash, here is what the hon. member for North Toronto will call a 'lead-loaded' lash, and I refuse to be driven by any such lash as that. There is also a threat that if I will not vote as the man who penned these words and those who agree with him say I ought to vote, I will never again get back to this House. Sir, I think it is the right of the electors in any riding, it is not only the right but the duty—and a duty perhaps that is not often enough exercised—I believe it is the right of the people in every riding to keep in touch with their representative, it is the right of the people of every riding to make known their views to their repre-