

ourable course than to go out from the government and voice his opposition to that measure. Is that a good Liberal principle to-day? Is it, or is it not? That is the only *raison d'être* that the Minister of the Interior had. He has not abjured his principles, he keeps them still. He declares that it is with reluctance that he will vote for the measure. He says, "section 1 is an interference, and he wishes it were not there; but on one consideration he will vote for that interference. Why? Because it is supplemented by a subsection which declares that money shall be put behind the interference to make it effective. There is consistency for you. He hates the plague, he says it destroys the family, it decimates society, but if only you support it by a money vote by which you can scatter the plague far and wide, then he welcomes it. That is the argument, that is the reasoning of the Minister of the Interior, if he has any left at all. He declares that his principles are not abjured, but he straightway repudiates them by his vote. The man who cried for freedom from slavery, cried it from 1890 to 1896, through all the concessions and counties of the west, and of Ontario, cried for unshackled limbs in the provinces, comes in to-day, and while declaring that he has not abjured his principles in the least, he votes to do what he declares himself shackles and creates an interference with the free life of two great provinces in the west, enduring and irrevocable. Time was when a man who held a principle as strong as that on so grave an issue, would not have dared to stand before the public an instant after having gone back upon his principles. Why does he do it? Why? I am not going to search for any reasons at all, I am going to give the reason that he gives—the King's government must go on. The Finance Minister says, the King's government must go on. Do they not mean in their heart of hearts that the Liberal government must go on? It is the Liberal government which must go on, and principle, consistency, constitution, everything must be sacrificed, but the King's—to wit, the Liberal—government must go on. The Minister of Finance used it as a threat—I never heard a more unworthy argument in this House, and hope never to hear such an argument again. If that principle and that method is adopted what government can be pure and well conducted; for never, if not in this case, will men go out because they do not agree in principle with the legislation which is proposed. Yet the King's government must go on, that is to say, the party must be kept in power, principle and constitution may be thrown to the winds.

But the Minister of the Interior has wonderful knowledge from his acquaintance on the street. He has been too much on the street. Too close a connection with the man

on the street is apt to becloud the moral sense, is apt to throw a pall over principle, it is not conducive to the highest and clearest thought. What is his argument? The constitution orders this, says the right hon. premier. The constitution does not compel it, says the leader of the opposition. So the ex-Minister of the Interior says that the man on the street gets confused. He hears both say that they are correct, sees both stand on the same rock. The man on the street says, he cannot understand the constitution, but wants to know what you are going to enact. But there are men on the street and men on the street. I can conceive of a man on the street who cultivates a very valuable farm out in Carleton county. I go to him and say: My good friend, you think you own that farm.—Yes.—Well, I think I own it. Let us sit down now and let us discuss what is the best method of cultivating that farm. What does the man on the street say to me? The first thing he says is, Sir, don't you think I had better know first how the title reads? If the title is in me, I will take your advice, but I will not take your domination; if the title is in you, I may give you advice, but I will not try to dominate you. My first duty is to ascertain the title of the property. I will discuss the details of the business afterwards.

So there are men on the street and men on the street, and it is not the better class of men on the street from whom the Minister of the Interior has received his inspiration. Forty-one per cent of the people of this country, the Minister of Finance says, bids us put this article into the constitution. Forty-one per cent of this country in 1896 seemed to be up in arms against remedial legislation in the province of Manitoba. What right has the Minister of Finance to say that forty-one per cent of the people of this country demand it? But does he pay a compliment to the forty-one per cent of the intelligent, educated, law-abiding, patriotic Catholics in this country, if, when a question comes up and has been fought out in the high court of parliament, and the majority is against them, he makes them say that they will make government impossible in this country.

What Catholic says that? No intelligent, patriotic Catholic says it. Every patriotic and intelligent Catholic throws that back in the teeth both of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior and the hon. Minister of Finance and that when they want an excuse for going back on their principles and their records they should get a better excuse than to say that 41 per cent of the citizens of this country, if they cannot get what they want, will cause anarchy and revolution. The Minister of Finance ventured something else, and I commend it to the hon. member for Labelle. He said: Oh yes, we can afford to be tolerant; we must recollect that 41 per cent of the people are