read the constitution of this country, as I read the British North America Act, and the Manitoba School Act, I say that there is within the provisions of the Constitution an appeal given to the minority in Manitoba wherever they feel oppressed by local legislation in the matter of education."

Mr. Laurier takes the ground that the appeal is given within the bounds of the Constitution. The next authority is a gentleman Mr. Davies will give some respect to. It is that of a gentleman by the name of Mr. L. H. Davies. (cheers) He said, "I have not heard any lawyer who valued his reputation, any lawyer of standing or any constitutional authority ever express the doubt that there is a power constitutionally vested in the Government of Canada to hear an appeal, and that after they have heard and allowed the appeal there is power on the part of this Parliament to intervene and enact a remedial order, if it chose."

I will now quote you the opinion of the Hon. David Mills. He says:

"It is also a well settled rule that where there is a right by law in the suppliant to seek for relief there is a corresponding duty to hear his complaint, and if a substantial right or privilege be injuriously affected or destroyed, to redress the grievance and restore the privilege taken away. This legal and constitutional obligation rests upon every state functionary from the Sovereign down to the humblest officer to whom any portion of state authority is entrusted."

I ask you does not the statement of the Hon. Wilfred Laurier and those of Mr. L. H. Davies and the Hon. David Mills prove that the ground taken by THE EXAMINER is right?

PROTESTANT SCHOOLS RETAINED.

My friend, Mr. Davies, speaking the other day said that the Archbishop and the Catholic minority had alleged in their memorials that schools had been taken from them and Protestant schools retained and the Catholics were obliged to send their children to Protestant schools. Mr. Davies says that statement has been contradicted. Mr. Laurier says it was never contradicted. He said that in 1893 he had carefully looked over the documents in Parliament and he never saw it contradicted. The schools established for Protestants remain there to this day. Hon. Joseph Martin, the author of the Manitoba School Act, declared that if he had his own way he would sweep every vestige of religion from the schools,—and every person who knows Mr. Martin believes him. (Laughter.)

NOT A QUESTION OF SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

I am aware that a great effort is being made in some parts of the Dominion to make the people believe that the election is being fought out on the ground as to whether we shall have separate schools or not. You are asked to choose between those two. I deny that statement altogether. There is no truth in it. I will refer you again to the Hon. David Mills. This is what he says:

"The policy of the country in respect to separate schools is already decided. That decision is incorporated in the Constitution as much so as the principle of representation between the provinces in the House of Commons. It is only because of this that the question can come before Parliament at all. The law grants to the minority, whose rights and privileges can be effected, an appeal to the Governor-General in Council, not to decide whether it is good or bad policy to have Separate Schools, the constitution settles that, but for the purpose of ascertaining whether a right or privilege in a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education has been affected by any Provincial law or any Provincial authority. Parliament is not called upon to decide whether, as a matter of policy, separate schools ought or ought not to exist. If they have not been created in the province, no matter how favorable the opinion of the House might be to them, it cannot create them; and if they do exist, no matter how hostile its opinions may be, it cannot abolish them. These two facts stand like walls of adamant on either side of the narrow way which is open to us of that narrow field of jurisdiction under our control."

This is the opinion of a man who enjoys the respect of every member of the House of Commons. So you see that this cry of Separate Schools is not the policy the Government are going to the country on. My own views on this question may not be worth a great deal, but as my views and the position taken by me twenty years ago when there was considerable discussion and controversy on the matter, may be drawn into this discussion before the controversy is over, I think I am right in calling attention to some expressions of opinion which I gave on this question at that time—opinions that I have not materially changed to this day. In 1876, I was a candidate for the Fort Augustus district in what was called the "school election." Many of the young generation, and some of the older ones, have been industriously taught to believe that I and my friends at that time endeavored to foist a separate school system on the people of Prince Edward Island. I will read my address to the electors on that occasion, in order that my position may be correctly understood:

"Gentlemen,—I beg leave to inform you that I am a candidate for the representation of this, my native district, in the House of Assembly. Believing that separate schools are wholly unsuited to this colony, I will, if elected, assist in passing an education law based on the free school system already in existence. In Charlottetown the public school system has never been efficient, making no provision for the division of the city into districts for school purposes, and giving the inhabitants no power to assess themselves for the erection of schoolhouses. As might have been expected, the public schools—ill supported and inefficient—have been largely superseded by schools provided at great expense by religious bodies. (Particularly by the Roman Catholic, Methodist and Church of England people. While these schools are maintained independent of the state, it would be unjust, in my opinion, to tax denominations who have thus provided ample school accommodation for themselves to build and maintain schools for the benefit of others. Admitting the principle that public money should only be paid for secular instruction, the difficulty may be met in the towns of the Island as it has been in the cities of Scotland, where denominational schools receive Government support on condition of their being so far placed under government control as to ensure the imparting of a good, sound secular education."

That was my card, and in 1894, when I entered the Senate, it was my lot to take some part in the discussion of this question, which had assumed its present form for the first time in many years. I had been called upon to put my views on record, and I did so; and before entering into a general discussion of the Manitoba School question, I made use of these observations:

"In a mixed community, such as we have in almost every part of Canada, we have to fight the battles of life side by side, whether we are Roman Catholics, and as we have to do that, on my own part I think it is desirable that our children shall learn to know each other and to trust each other and to appreciate each other in the classroom and on the play ground, as well as when they have chosen their employments and assumed the more responsible duties of life. I myself have had my children educated in the public schools. Of course we look carefully after our schools, look after the tone of morality in them, and I have still to learn that the fundamental principles of our common Christianity have been eliminated from those schools. They do not go into details. My creed is not taught there as distinct from the creed of any other denomination, but the fundamental doctrines of Christianity are not eliminated from the instruction. While I hold the view and hold it warmly, and assert it here as I have on many previous occasions asserted it elsewhere, that a public schools system is best for a mixed community, I have taken this further ground: I recognize the fact that there is a very large proportion of my fellow subjects in this country who believe differently from me, with whom it is a matter of conscience that their children should receive a denominational education; and, therefore, more than twenty years ago I took the stand that when the assertion of that right, or when the granting of that privilege to them touches upon no right or privilege which I or my fellow Protestant citizens value or esteem, I am willing to let them adopt the system of education which they conscientiously believe to be the best."

This question of schools in Manitoba is a different one altogether from that with which we have to deal here in the Lower Provinces. It conforms more nearly to the state of affairs in Quebec than in the other provinces. The Catholics and Protestants of Manitoba are not merely separated by religion, but by race and language. There is a wide gulf between them; and it is next to impossible, at the present time, at all events, without doing grievous injustice to the minority, to attempt to force them to adopt the common school system in Manitoba. And whether wise or not, the highest court in the realm, and the Constitution have decided that this

MINORITY HAD A GRIEVANCE,

which the Government had a right to redress. The Hon. Mr. Mills said that, with this fact established, "the duty devolves upon the Government to whom that appeal is addressed to give the necessary relief." And if that faith should be broken in Manitoba, and if the men who have broken that faith are to be upheld in that course by others in the Province of Manitoba, we shall have troublesome questions in the Province of Quebec. If the majority in Quebec would establish separate schools to suit themselves and their own conscientious convictions, and if we forced the schools of that majority upon the Protestant minority, speaking another language, there would have to be a reckoning with every man speaking the English language and having the blood of an Englishman in his veins. The British and Scotch of Canada and elsewhere would come to the relief of that minority and help them. Why should we as British subjects be less willing to stand up for the rights of one thousand French Halfbreed and Roman Catholic people in Manitoba than for the Protestants of Quebec if their rights were infringed upon. It is not a question of whether separate or public schools are the better. Is is a question whether the constitution of Manitoba shall be maintained in its integrity. If the constitution is not, confederation can never be maintained. I could take all the time you could possibly give me this evening in quoting most eminent authorities to show that Confederation was only brought about by compromise on this question of education. The Protestants of Quebec would never have entered confederation and thrown themselves into the power of the French majority in Quebec until their rights had been solemnly guaranteed by Act of Parliament. History, sir, tells us that, and no one will deny it. Sir Alexander Galt, the leader of the English minority in Quebec, resigned his seat in the Government of Sir John McDonald because guarantees in this connection were not carried out as promised. Neither were Mr. Holton, Sir John Rose and other leaders, both Liberals and Conservatives, satisfied until guarantees were formally placed in the British North American Act and confirmed by the Legislature of the province of Quebec. I would like to deal with some other phases of the school question. But, sir, I cannot take up too much of your time.

THE TRADE QUESTION.

I therefore, must address myself to a question which is a most important one, complicated as it is, to every man, woman and child all over this "Canada of Ours." That is the trade question. My friend Mr. Davies made a very important announcement on this platform the other night with regard to this question. I had the pleasure of seeing a report of his speech as it appeared in the Patriot newspaper, and I will venture to read a few words from it to show the position which he has taken upon the trade question in that speech. He says:

"If we were starting out afresh in the Dominion, the Liberal party would go for practical free trade. They would not have, I believe, more than a 12 or 15 per cent tariff; but the Liberal party know that today, with an expenditure of $38,000,000 a year, it is impossible to have free trade. You must raise sufficient revenue to meet necessary expenditures, and do what you will you must recognize the fact that for 15 years certain manufacturing industries have been fostered and protected in this country, and there is not a man in the Liberal party who would desire, at one fell swoop, suddenly to adopt a policy which would destroy these manufacturing industries. We will wage war to the knife against all trusts and trade monopolies, against all excessive taxation, against that portion of the tariff which exacts undue protection in favor of one class of the community and takes it out of the mass."

I have read a pretty lengthy extract in order to show, as announced by Mr. Davies, in opening his speech on this platform the other night, what his present views on the Trade Question are. Now I will just turn for a moment to a speech delivered by Mr. Davies at Middleton, N. S., in 1893, to show that he held very different views then from what he now entertains, to show the wobbling policy the Liberal Party are pursuing on this great question. Speaking at Middleton, then, in September of 1893, Mr. Davies said:

"But there come times when both party issues disappear, and the great historical parties of the country divide upon some vital issue, which affects not only the present but the future interests of the people. To-day the people of Canada stand face to face with an issue, and the next contest is to be one between free trade and protection."

Mr. Davies, speaking of this very contest in which we are now engaged, said the issue was to be distinctly between Free Trade and Protection, and he went further:—

"The policy of the Liberal Party on the contrary, is the reform of the tariff by the elimination from it of every vestige of protection. In our convention platform we denounced the protective system as unfair, unjust and burdensome."

He now declares that they will take care that there will not be undue protection. A 12 or 15 per cent tariff, remember, will not be sufficient. Certain industries have grown up during the past fifteen years of Protection, and they would not desire, at one fell swoop, to wipe them away. But he will take care that there will not be "undue protection." A very safe policy, and if you stick to it for any length of time, not very different from that of the Liberal-Conservative Party. (Applause). But Mr. Davies went on in that speech and he amplified on this question of protection. He found some dreadful things and he used

VERY STRONG LANGUAGE

in condemning them. He found there was an "enormous iniquity," as he called it, existing in the tariff of Canada, of a duty of 1¼ cents a pound on cleaned rice, and only 3-10 of a cent on uncleaned rice imported, and this was one of the changes, he assured the people, would be made in the tariff of Canada if the Liberal Party were to come into power. (Laughter). That duty of 1¼ cents on rice realized the enormous sum of $73,000 in 1895 (I am quoting his own figures), and it amounted to the large sum of 1¼ cents per head on every man, woman and child in Canada. That is one of the great changes he will effect in the tariff (laughter). Mr. Davies then took up the question of cordage and kerosene oil, which he described as iniquitous, and which he said it were terrible to contemplate. The duty on kerosene oil is less than 14 cents per head of the population. He next came to a subject of very great importance, namely,

THE IRON DUTIES.

This, he said, wrested from the people a large amount of money amounting to millions, and they were iniquitous in a very strong sense of the term, in the way that he uses terms. Without going into a description of these iron duties, we must bear in mind that the press telegrams of the last four and twenty hours have brought news which appears to gladden the hearts of the Liberals all over the Dominion, and it is to the effect that Sir Oliver Mowat is going to help Mr. Laurier (if Mr. Laurier is strong enough to help himself) after the election. (Laughter and applause). Sir Oliver Mowat will take a seat in the Senate although there is no vacancy and although Mr. Laurier is not in a position to put him in, and is not very likely to be for many a long year. (Laughter) The charming Sir Oliver Mowat has said so many nice good things for Laurier that the Liberal Party feel in their hearts they have a right to fall down and worship him and do everything to please him. But if he is actually going to enter the Administration, what do you think will be the load he will carry when he goes over? Iron bounties. (Hear, hear). Not merely the duties that Mr. Davies condemns so strongly as being so burdensome on the people, not merely the duties the Federal Government exact, not merely the Dominion bounties, but the the Province of Ontario has added additional bounties over and above those of the Federal Government. (Applause). This is the Liberal Party who go the people of Canada and ask them to support them as free traders, and in another breath say they will not give "undue protection" (Laughter). Why, their great big little statesman, Mowat, for whom they say so many good things, would carry to their party the weight of these great iron duties enhanced and increased beyond what Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Thompson and Sir Charles Tupper ever said they would be. (Applause). Had I time I would go back a little and tell you what I dare say many of you have not entirely forgotten, that the Liberal party have had in their platform in 1891 the big plank of

UNRESTRICTED RECIPROCITY.

We heard a great deal about Unrestricted Reciprocity on that occasion. Mr. Davies said that was the policy that would make the people of P. E Island rich. Sir Richard Cartwright said it would increase the value of all the farm lands in Canada by $10 or $11 per head, and it would increase the value of every horse in Canada $20. It was intended to adopt this policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity. I think you will bear me out when I say that in that campaign of 1891 my friend, Mr. Blake, and myself, in contesting the County, took no middle ground on that question. We told the people that this policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity was a bad one. We showed up all the evils that would follow in its train, and I think we satisfied the people of Queen's County that it was a bad policy that reduced their majority from 1,000 to 300. (Applause, hear, hear.) During that campaign it began to leak out that the Hon. Edward Blake, the Leader of their party in the Province of Ontario, did not believe in that policy, and he refused to become a candidate in that election, because he would not support the policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States. I made that statement at a meeting at Eldon during that campaign. Messrs. Blake and Davies were there, and Mr. Davies spoke after me, and said it was entirely without foundation. "Ferguson is entirely wrong," he said; "Mr. Blake would take no position like that. Mr. Blake declined to run his election because he was in bad health; he did not differ at all with our policy."

I repeated that it was true and Mr. Davies said he would produce the proof. He brought the proof at the next meeting, submitting a telegram addressed to him by Sir Oliver Mowat in which he assured Mr Davies that Mr. Blake in his address to the electors of West Durham on retiring from the representation declined their nomination in that election and stated that he had not discussed any political question whatever in that contest. Of course Mr. Davies had the better of me. Here was the telegram signed by Mowat. I was from 1,000 to 1,500 miles away, and I was not in a position to do anything but accept the explanation. What did we find? Scarcely was the election over and the ballots counted when out came the address of the Hon. Edward Blake to the electors of West Durham in which he pointed out, step by step, their policy and wound up by saying he would prefer going down in his little boat in silence rather than support Unrestricted Reciprocity, a policy in which he did not believe. (Great applause). That was kept back during the elections and it came out after the elections were over. (Applause)

The facts became known and the people of Canada found that we had made the discovery. The Liberal Party abandoned their policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United states. They cannot altogether deny the advocacy of it; but on every occasion they will deny, most indignantly deny, that they ever advocated Commercial Union. Mr. Davies spoke at that Middleton meeting to which I have already made reference, and he said that,—

"Commercial Union may be a good thing or a bad thing, I will not now discuss it; but that policy has never been advocated by the Liberal Party or by any authorized member of the Liberal Party."

Now, with regard to that, I will just confront Mr. Davies' statement with an extract from a speech made by himself at the Cape Travarse meeting on August 24th 1887 in which he made use of the following words:

"The idea that we would be disloyal to the British flag under Commercial Union was humbug. He wanted to live under the flag as well as anyone, but he wanted a flag under which he could live. (Applause). The key-note should be struck in the banner Province. Commercial Union means a uniform tariff from the North Pole to the Gulf of Mexico. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 he was prepared to accept, but he was afraid the Americans were unwilling to concede it. As Commercial Union seemed more easily attained, he was prepared to support it because he believed it would secure to us wealth, peace and happiness."

These are the words of Mr. Louis H. Davies himself, and when we come to compare this statement with that of his Middleton statement, that commercial union was never supported or advocated by the Liberal party, or by any authorized member of the Liberal party, we must conclude that his memory is very bad or that he rules himself out of being an authorized member of the Liberal party. (Applause.) While the Opposition party have been wandering and wabbling on the trade question in all these different ways, the Liberal-Conservative party have stood, during twenty years, firmly and strongly on the

PLATFORM OF THE NATIONAL POLICY.

It became painfull apparent to everyone in Canada and the United States before the institution of the National Policy, that the protective policy was ruining this country. The state of the country was deplorable in 1878. I could read from the words of Sir Richard Cartwright himself, in his budget speech, delivered in the House of Commons in 1878, in which he deplored the state of the country. We were, he said, poor and not able to buy much, and the reductions in the revenue and in the volume of our trade were extraordinary. The Liberal Conservative Party nailed the flag of moderate protection to its mast in 1878. They went to the country on that policy, and the people of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific appreciated the new policy adopted under unusual circumstances, and they supported it. In 1882, the Liberal Conservative Party again went to the people of Canada with the same old flag and the same old National Policy; and the people of the Dominion again sustained them. Again, in 1887, the Liberal-Conservative Party went to the country, and so strong was the National Policy in the affections of the people of the country that it enabled the Party to obtain power in the face of the racial and other questions that had been raised by the Liberal Party in Quebec over the execution of Riel. Again, in 1891, the same banner was unfurled, and once more the Liberal-Conservative Party was victorious. And again in 1896 we come to the people of Canada with the same old flag and the same old policy, modified, it is true, from time to time, according to the ever-changing circumstances of the country,—whenever any duty has seemed to have outlived its usefulness or has ceased to foster any great industry, we have cut off the mouldering braches. But wherever necessary we have given moderate protection, not to enrich combines, but to develop the industries of our country, and to cause Canada, as you say in one of the inscriptions on the wall to-night, to be "Canada for the Canadians." (Loud applause).

REDUCTION OF TAXATION.

But before I leave this question I want to put before you a few simple facts on the trade questions. It is stated that we are a very heavily taxed people. The result of the Government's policy is to bear us down with taxes. If you will take the trouble to look over the figures you will find we are taxed about three dollars per head. I am speaking of the general taxation and customs taxation—less than the people of free trade England. But this is not all. We maintain a reasonable duty on articles we manufacture ourselves, and we have thus protected home industries. This has enabled us to provide ample means for revenue purposse and the carrying on of needful public works.

The Liberal-Conservative Government have, during four years, taken forty million dollars off the people by taking taxes off the necessaries of life. I will point out in a few words what these articles are. In 1882 the duty was taken off tea. The removal of the duty on tea has from that time down to the present saved the people of Canada in taxes $11,034,089. Up to that time, during the McKenzie administration and during the first few years of the National Policy and Conservative Administration, we had a duty on tea. But in 1882 this duty, paid by the poor and rich alike, and often more by the poor than the rich, was removed and the saving has been over eleven millions of dollars. In the same year the duty was taken off coffee and the amount saved to the people of the Dominion by that is $832,5[illegible]8. In 1887 the duty was taken off anthracite coal and the amount saved in taxes was $6,044,355. In 1882 the duty was taken off tin. This is a most important item to us, who are so largely engaged in the lobster industry, and soon I hope we are going to have other important canning industries. The amount saved by this was $1,465,103.

In short, we have taken off duties amounting in the last five years to $19,891,995. The duty on bill stamps was taken off in 1882. They still have that duty in free trade England. The saving thus accomplished was $3,267,388. The tax on newspapers was taken off in 1834, and $613,864 in taxes saved there. In 1890 the duty was taken off molasses, or reduced, and this amounted to $335,775. The duty was taken off window glass, amounting to $185,980. Altogether, the grand total of duties taken off the necessaries of life, and articles such as newspapers and bill stamps, is $43,631,027. Altogether about twenty-seven of the essentials of life have been taken off the dutiable list during these years under the National Policy.

THE CRISIS.

My friend, Mr. Davies, said a good deal with regard to the crisis in January, and he said a number of things which I will not characterize as being actually incorrect or untrue, but to be explained by that extraordinary faculty he has for paraphrasing the sayings of other people, and at the same time thinking he is doing justice. (Laughter) He said some seven of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's colleagues had separated from him and explained that they did it because he was an old fool and an imbecile, and that in consequence of their action a great deal of delay occurred, and in consequence of that delay the Remedial bill was not passed. I do not think there is any considerable number of people in this city who will believe or accept very much of that. The unfortunate crisis that occurred in January, and which was mostly due to misunderstanding, consumed one week of time. When the House met on the 7th of January, after an adjournment, this question had presented itself, and on the 14th of January the Government was again reconstructed and there had been lost just seven days, only four of which were working days for the House of Commons. So there were only four working days lost. (Applause.)

HIS OWN POSITION.

It is due, I think, speaking to you for the first time after my return, that I should explain my own position at that time. The Leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, is a man for whom I entertain a great deal of respect—I might say affection; but I felt in my heart that there was one man in Canada and one only more fit to lead the party to victory and that was Sir Charles Tupper. But I did not want to bring the change about by any disruption among our friends. I said to them, I wanted to bring this about by means of conciliation. I felt for Sir Mackenzie Bowell. He was an honest man and a statesman, and I sat by his side in the Senate for two years and observed his actions and felt he was a good and able man. But I felt at the same time that Sir Charles was as good a man and a still abler man. (Cheers;)

I lent myself to the work of conciliation and bringing about a reunion of these gentleman whom I believe should be working for the good of the country in the Cabinet. I succeeded along with some other gentlemen in bringing about conciliation. There never was, however, any breach between Sir Charles Tupper and McKenzie Bowell. There was not such good feeling between Sir McKenzie and some other gentlemen of that Cabinet as there should have been. When he was re-constructing the Cabinet he offered me a portfolio if I would help him and leave our former colleagues out. I advised him not to do it. In the interests of Canada and the Party I said I would not be a party to disruption. With the aid and influence and advice of Sir Charles Tupper, who was now more fully in touch with us, having lately come into the country, I felt they could be brought back into the Government, therefore I refused to accept a portfolio until an offer had been extended to these gentlemen. I said, if they refuse I will stand by you and do the very best I can for the good government of the country. The gentlemen returned. Harmony was restored in every respect, and the Government went on with its work.

OPPOSITION OBSTUCTION.

Mr. Davies says we did not introduce the Remedial Bill until the end of February, and it was not read a second time until the 17th of March. It was introduced on the 11th of February—that is what he called the end of February—and most valuable work had been put in before then. The debate on the address had taken place. This is usually a long debate, and an important one, more so this year than ordinarily. This debate was completed, the Budget Speech given, and the debate on that concluded, and this was a long and important debate. I do not say there was time lost on it, because before an election it is necessary to have very full discussion of the trade questions in the Budget debate. The Remedial Bill was introduced on the 11th of February, although its final consideration was not reached until later. A great deal of time was lost because the Liberals said that we had met for the purpose of passing that Remedial Bill and not for any other business, and they refused to allow business to be advanced stage by stage as is always done when the time is economized. One matter after another was brought up, but they refused to allow business to proceed. When we moved to go into supply they met us with a motion to adjourn, and day after day and night after night time was lost on the question of supply, and we were beaten later on in getting the Remedial Bill through. When it was introduced and reached its second reading it gave rise to loufi discussion. I do not complain of discussion with the Speaker in the chair. It was a necessary and important debate and I do not charge against any man that he did wrong when he took reasonable time to place his views on record on this important subject, but I say when the bill was read a second time there still remained five weeks, and one week was enough if the House had done its best in perfecting the details of that bill. When a majority of the House—a considerable majority—had declared in favor of that bill, I say it was the duty of every man who loved his country to address himself earnestly and carefully to the perfection of the details of that bill and do what he could to make it better, and if it was defective he should try to remedy the defects. I will not say that the bill had no defects. Day after day and night after night intermerminable speeches were made. No sooner did the House go into Committee than a member would move that the Committee rise and then the obstructionists could speak on that and then there would be a motion to adjourn and again the obstructionists would go in and speak again, and time was wasted: not in relevant discussion but in in obstruction, until finally the time had so passed and the 15th day of April had come, and it was then apparent that no time was left to complete the remaining clauses of the bill. There were 80 or 90 clauses still to be considered, and no supplies had been voted. The consequence would be very serious to the country were Parliament closed on the 24th of April without money being voted to carry on the various services. So the Government was forced to abandon the bill, and try to pass such necessary supplies as would keep the public service running until the 1st of July, and as a result of the extraordinary conduct of these gentlemen the Remedial Bill was not passed, and other important measures could not be advanced.

THE LIBERAL PARTY BLAMEABLE.

It was the conduct, in the first place, of the Liberal party in Manitoba that launched this troublesome question on arena of Dominion politics. They had brought up a troublesome question for the people of Canada and ever since there has been fighting over it. Elements as widely different as possible combined in condemning the Government for having sent the question to the court. Mr. Tarte would rise and move a resolution, and Mr. Dalton McCarthy would speak and vote in favor of it. Men who professed to hold views exactly opposite to each other, were one in their policy of stirring up opposition on the question. They had saddled a difficulty on the Government, and demanded why not manfully take that difficulty up and settle it. When the bill came befare the House what did we find? We found that in the Gpposition there was every shade of opinion. McCarthy objected, not because it was premature. He said everybody who had eyes to see and ears to hear knew the facts. He opposed it because he wanted to extirpate the French language, and force a certain kind of schools on the people of every creed and race. That was the view he took, and Mr. Geoffrein and Mr. Tarte opposed it because it did not go far enough. They wanted the Parliament to pay over a part of the revenue of Manitoba for the support of separate schools. They complained because Catholic would have a voice as to whether their children should go to the public or separate schools. They said that was interfering with the rights of the Catholics, that they had no right to have any voice in the matter. And then we have Mr. Laurier declaring in Chicoutimi that when he came into power he would see that his compatriots in the province of Manitoba should have their rights restored to them, and he said he could do it because, said he, "thank God, we have no Orangemen among us, the Liberals." Thus we have the Liberal party using those shameful tactics, one section inciting the people of Quebec to demand more than the law and constitution would allow them; another wing trying to raise sectional and racial feelings by pointing out to tdem that the Government were giving away to the hierarchy in Quebec Thus by inciting prejudices as widely separaated as these to fight together to prevent a settlement they are trying to drive the Conservative party from power. That is their whole object. So intent and so anxious are they for power that they have resorted to all kinds of schemes. They have resorted to this obstruction, to all these different methods and means of obstruction in the hope of gaining the support of the Protestants on the one side, and the French Catholics on the other. In one place they cry out because we have gone so far, and in another, because we have not gone far enough. This shows what kind of men they are and what kind of men their leaders are. You remember some months ago—some time in last year—that a young Irishman named Shortis shot some people in the town of Valleyfield, in the county of Beauharnois. He was tried, found guilty and sentenced to be hanged, and the Governor-General acting within the lines of the Constitution, commuted the sentence to imprisonment for life. Two of the men shot were French-Canadians, and a very considerable feeling existed between the Irish there and the French-Canadians with regard to this matter. The French people became excited, and held meetings, reviving the memory of the Riel execution. Notwithstanding the plea of insanity, demagogues aroused them to a white heat. What do you think the Hon. Wilfred Laurier did? This man, of whom so many grand things are said, this beautiful white man of the Liberal Party, the Leader of that Party! (Laughter). He takes Israel Tarte and goes to Beauharois and plants him as a candidate, and tries to get him elected on the ground of the commutation of the sentence of Shortis. The law they said favored an Irishman, and his sentence was commuted, and there not being many Irish in the county of Beauharnois, Mr. Tarte went down and tried to make political out of it. Mr. Tarte had been driven out of every respectable constituency, and never showed himself a second time after being once elected. He is now the candidate trying to defeat the Deputy Speaker, Mr. Bergeron, on the question of whether it was proper to commute this sentence of death on this man Shortis.

SCANDALS.

The Opposition have issued a campaign sheet and it is devoted to scandals—some terrible things done by Conservatives. There is the McGreevy scandal, the Curran Bridge scandal, the Soulanges Canal and the Tay Bridge and a number of other things. There are a great many charges against Sir Adolphe Caron and Hon. John Haggart. I want just to say this: Mr. Haggart is the only gentleman who is now a member of the Cabinet who is charged with wrong doing.

Mr. Haggart is charged with some connection with the Section B contract of the Canada Pacific Railway in 1879, many years before he became a member of the Parliament of Canada. That charge was never preferred until the 21st of September 1891, at the close of a six months' session After Parliament had been in session all summer investigating one charge after another, Parliament refused to go into committee, and from that time to the present it has never been referred to by a member of Parliament, and Mr. Haggart has always been ready to meet it. He has been elected four or five times to Parliament, since the alleged wrong doing and no man has ever brought it forward since Mr. Lister did in 1891, when Parliament could not wait to investigate the charge. I am going to deal with this question in this way. I do not claim during the time the Conservatives have been in power that every one of their men have been pure, that there has been nothing wrong. I make no such claim. If such a thing could happen, you would calculate you had not human beings, but perfect angels. I ask you is there anybody in this community who would undertake to handle $ 8,000,000 of money, and find that not a dollar had gone wrong, that no servant had misappropriated a dollar, and that no contract had gone wrong. It is plain, so long as we have fallible human beings something will go wrong, and I do not claim that the Liberal-Conservative party has not made mistakes. The best politicians make mistakes; the public records show it. And I do not contend that the Liberal party are all black sheep—that they are all corrupt. I take no such position, There are honorable men among them. They have good and bad, as we have. The best test is how do they treat their boodlers? I ask you to look at what the Liberal Conservative party have done. Sir Hector Langevin held an exalted position, but charges were made against him. Nothing was proven to seriously affect him, but something had gone wrong in the department under him and he was pushed out of the Liberal Conservative Cabinet. He had to get out. In the same way charges were made against Sir Adolphe Caron. These charges have not been proven. His opponents did not come to confront him still they insist in making these charges and have filled a great deal of this wholesome, this beautiful pamphlet with aspersions against Caron which they had not the manliness to come forward and support. But Caron has left the administration. He is not a member of the Government.

I ask you, gentlemen, how the Government acted in the case of Thomas McGreevy. He had been a valuable public man. But the moment the was found to be connected with those transactions, Sir John Thompson was the man who rose in his place and moved that his supporter should be expelled from Parliament. (Cheers). When the member for the Niagara District, (Mr Rykert) was found to be mixed up in some disreputable transaction, he also was expelled. I say that whenever the government found a man who was connected in any way with fraud or corruption he was immediately put aside. Have the Liberal Party a record like this? Look at Mercier the late leader of the the Grits of Quebec; he who plundered over $300,000, most of which was spent to help the Liberals in the Dominion Election of 1891, and after all this he was returned as leader of the party and he died in the Liberal ranks. A club in Quebec is called after him, and a monument is being erected to perpetuate the name of the man who was without doubt the greatest boodler the country has ever seen. Oh, no; the party never repudiated him. I ask you to judge the parties by the efforts they make to keep down boodling and corruption. That is the way to decide.

A GOOD HOPE.

From this platform on, Thursday last, Mr. Davies said that for the first time in a great many years he went into the contest with a good hope of success. But you know that that has been his claim since 1878. We have heard his cry that Mackenzie and Blake and Laurier were carrying the banner of victory from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that the Tories were going to be downed on every side. Then in 1891, he had the very date fixed on, the Liberal party were going to secure the reins of power. He declared that he himself was going to be elected by 1800 of a majority. He now says that for the first time in many years he is going in with the idea that the Liberals are going to be successful. (Loud applause) I feel almost sorry to have to puncture his hopes. From what I learn from the accounts that have come to me, I feel that the Conservative party are going forward to the greatest victory ever achieved in Canada. (Loud applause.) I feel that the people of this country, whether French or English, Catholic or Protestant, no matter what race or creed they belong to, are intelligent enough to record their votes in favor of the party that will stand by them and their rights, who are marching steadily forward to build up our industries and make Canada one of the greatest countries of the world. (Great applause.)

Short, stirring addresses were then delivered by Dr. Jenkins, Mr. Hackett, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Martin and Mr. A. C. McDonald.

The meeting broke up at twelve o'clock amid cheers for the Minister and cheers for the Candidates.

The Reign of Love.

Were England to fall from her high estate, to lose her pre-eminence among the nations of the world, to sink to the rank of a second-rate Power, not only would our own liberty be grievously impaired, but the cause of liberty throughout the world would receive a deadly wound. In approaching the question it is essentially necessary to clear one's mind of that sickly sentimentality, that optimistic cant of "humanitarianism," as it is called, which is so unpleasant a sign of the times. "War and hate," have not retired from the world to make room for men, and for nations of men. Yes, and for "fruitful strifes and rivalries of peace." The struggle for existence is still the law for men, and for the nations of men. Yes, and will continue to be so for generations far beyond those of which we need take account. Human nature may be transformed in an indefinitely remote future. So may leonine nature. But in this epoch of the world wherein we have to live and act, if the lion lies down at all with the lamb, it is, as Sydney Smith said, with the lamb in his stomach. And if men forsake the use of swords and spears, it assuredly is not to convert them into plowshares and pruning hooks, but to substitute rifled canon for those antique instruments of slaughter, now found ineffectively murderous.

Surely, never was the aspect of Europe so threatening as it is at the present hour. Standing armies of a vastness hitherto undreamed of confront one another. The frontiers of every country are embattled. Railways are converted into military roads. The physical sciences are ransacked for engines of carnage. The whole Continent is an immense parade ground, destined—who can say how soon?—to become a vast battle-field. At such a time, who but a fool or a scoundrel would promise security to this country, so obnoxious to the jealousy, so attractive to the cupidity of her neighbors, save on the condition that she can vindicate it by arms?—Fortnightly Review.

Hong Kong is said to be infected with the black plague.

FOUND ON THE TRAINS

A MAN WHO FOR FIFTEEN YEARS HAS BEEN PICKING UP THINGS.

A Few Items From the Notebook of Charlie—People Who Forget Portable Property—Umbrellas Head the List of Forgotten Belongings.

Whenever during the daytime a New York, New Haven and Hartford train rolls into the Grand Central depot a stoop shouldered, little man, with keen gray eyes and a beard that doesn't grow with sufficient luxuriance to require frequent trimming, strolls down to the end of the platform. When the train stops and while the most laggard of the passengers are still leisurely alighting, he hops nimbly on the rear platform of the last car and proceeds to literally "go through" the train. Sometimes a much excited passenger who has suddenly recollected that he has forgotten something rushes madly back into the train and discovers his portable property in the hands of the little man. Then, if he is of a suspicious disposition, he glares and scowls at the little man, and sometimes pounces upon him and indignantly demands to be told what he is doing with "that."

Then a tired look comes into the little man's face and he mildly explains that he is employed by the company to search incoming trains for articles left behind by passengers, which he conveys to the lost property room, where the owners can always get possession of them again by furnishing presumptive evidence that the things belong to them.

When Charlie—that is what the other employees about the depot call him, although he has another name which appears on the payrolls of the company—first began this work, his beard wasn't tinged with gray, and he wasn't a bit stoop shouldered. That was 15 years ago. All these years, from 6:30 in the morning until 6:30 at night each day, he has been picking up things that careless passengers have forgotten to take with them when they left the train.

It would make any man stoop shouldered to be continually looking for things that long. But his eyes are as keen as ever, and his honesty is still proof against all temptations. If that were not the case, he could have retired with a snug little capital. From the pocketbooks and purses and "wads" that he has found while pursuing his unique occupation he could have slipped enough into his own pocket to render him quite independent.

There are no blanks in his daily records. Never a day goes by that he doesn't find something that somebody has forgotten. He picks up fewer things on Sundays than on any other days, because on Sundays travel is comparatively light, and passengers are apt to be less preoccupied with business cares and therefore not so likely to forget things. On some days his list of articles found on the incoming trains is quite a formidable one.

This, for instance, is what he turned into the lost property room on Aug. 17: Thirteen umbrellas, two rings (one plain gold and one with diamonds), one overcoat, one package of legal papers, one satchel, one lady's jacket, one Derby hat, one valise, one cape, one cane, one package of underwear, one mackintosh and one pocketbook.

And this is what he found on Aug. 27: Seven umbrellas, one parasol, one shawl, one overcoat, one pair of shoes, one package containing a suit of clothes, one pair of spectacles, one purse, one flask of whisky and one smelling bottle.

When the articles are taken to the lost property room, they are labeled with the date on which they are found and the number of the train. Nearly all the articles that have any intrinsic value are redeemed. The rest are simply stored away for the gnawing tooth of time to prey upon.

Charlie is of the opinion, and surely he may be regarded as an expert on the subject, that everybody is liable to forget something at some time or other. Umbrellas are the articles that are most frequently left behind on the trains by travelers. The man who could devise an infallible system by which the owner of an umbrella would always be sure to remember it would reap a fortune. Charlie has tried his own wits at it, but was forced to give it up.

He has come to the conclusion that a state of ecstatic happiness, equally with one of intense preoccupation, is apt to produce forgetfulness of portable property. He has discovered that newly married brides and grooms are quite as apt to forget the little things they may be carrying with them as the man who has got so much business on his hands he can't think of anything else. The man who never travels without a flask of whisky seldom forgets it. Perhaps that is because the act of putting it into his pocket immediately after taking a nip has been so often repeated that it belongs to the category of unconscious cerebration.

It is not an infrequent thing for a man to leave a stovepipe hat on the rack and walk out of the car with a little skull cap on. But when he gets into the streets the small boys are sure to shout, "Shoot the hat!" or "Where did you get that hat?" Then he discovers the mistake that he has made, but the fact that he is never grateful to the small boys for reminding him of it and never rewards them must be regarded as evidence of that perversity inheritent in human nature which so often puzzles the philosopher.

Charlie is of the opinion that some people would forget their own mothers-in-law if they had half a chance. There is one man whose umbrella he has picked up in the train so often that he has lost track of the number of times. And yet that same man has told him frequently that he never leaves the house with his umbrella that his wife doesn't say to him, "Now, dear, be sure you don't forget your umbrella."

Women, so Charlie has found, are even more apt to leave things behind them in the cars than men.—New York Herald.

True Feminine Economy.

He (grumblingly)—What on earth do you want a bicycle for? Do you know what they cost?

She—I cannot help what they cost. I must have one. I picked up a pair of bloomers at a bargain the other day, and I cannot afford to let them go to waste.

Knew What to Do.

Farmer Jones—You say you have learned so much at college that I want to test you. Suppose you were in the field and the goat should run at you, what would you do?

His Son—Grasp the horns of the dilemma.

An Echo of the Rail.

"They say that one of Jameson's raiders had a bullet right through the brain, and yet is getting well."

"The story is obviously a fake."

"Perhaps it is; but why 'obviously?'"

"Wasn't a man in the gang had any brain."—New York Recorder.

A Natural Inquiry.

"Chimmy," said a curbstone cherub, "what's de equator?"

"Don't you know? I learnt it in wan lesson at night school. De equator is an imaginary line around de eart'."

"Who put it dere? Great Britain?"—Washington Star.

ELECTRIC ICE FISHING.

Incandescent Lamps Used to Lure Hungry Fish to the Hook.

The recent cold spell of weather has not confined its pleasure giving to the skaters, for the ice fishermen have been out in force and some very good sport has been enjoyed by them. The latest trick in ice fishing is the use of the electric light. It was the Prince of Monaco who first realized the possibilities of an electric light as a lure for fish, and he made the first deep-sea trap with a light in it, and reaped a rich harvest.

A battery can be made at a cost of about $4, but it is easier to buy one for a about the same money. The outfit will consist of two jars, contained in a hardwood box, with two clips to which to attach the wires of the two poles, a three-candle power lamp and a wide-mouthed shallow glass jar. Take the lamp and twist about its center some light wire with loops sticking out in all directions, and place it in the jar, hanging it about midway between top and bottom by passing the current wires through the cork and wedging them in tight. The loop of wires about the lamp will serve to prevent the glass from breaking when the bottle swings about. A piece of inch-thick lead is attached to the bottom of the bottle to make it sink and hold it steady. This lead is attached by strings to the neck of the bottle, and a double cord is carried up to the surface, so that the bottle may be lowered or lifted without hauling on the wires.

When the lamp is lowered into the water and the current is turned on, it will attract every fish within 200 yards. About 4 feet to the right and left of the lamp hole other holes are cut in the ice for fishing. In these are placed the baited hooks on the old-time tip-ups. The light attracts the fish, and the bait and the hunger of the fish do the rest. The lamp will cost about 50 cents for eight hours. Care should be taken not to cut the fishing holes too close together, so as to weaken the ice and make it dangerous. The best way is to cut them in a semicircle at the back of the lamp hole and approach them from the far side.

As a rule the tackle may be obtained on the ground. If it is taken along a braided linen "C" line is the proper one, with a number of large sproat hooks on good and new gimp snells; gut is almost useless, as it is liable to tear from the rubbing it receives against the edge of the ice when it is drawn up, and also because it is liable to get very brittle from cold. It is as well to remember that only a very sharp ax should be used to cut the holes. As to bait, minnows are the best, and in places where they make a specialty of ice fishing, the local guides will have plenty; but, as a matter of fact, the fish are so hungry that they will take almost anything eatable, and a strip of salt pork, if very thin and fairly long, will do, with strips cut from the fish as they are caught. The one idea should be to make the bait as showy as possible, for the cold dulls the perceptions of the fish to a certain extent, and they do not appear to see as quickly as in warmer weather. As soon as they do see the bait they go for it with ten times the voracity. This is the reason why in several states fishing through the ice has been forbidden by law. The fish bite with such eagerness that people are afraid the supply of fish for the summer would be seriously depleted by the winter sport and especially the pike, pickerel and other game fish.

It is cold work, and a good fire on the bank is essential, while warm clothing and very thick, heavy shoes should be worn. Of course, skating can be indulged in at the same time, but if the ice fishing is good the fisherman will not want to bother about skating. If it is desired to keep the fish in perfect condition during the day, a good plan is to take the ax and chop out a trench 2 or 3 feet long, 1 foot wide, and nearly through the ice; then bore a tiny hole through the middle and let the water in. This makes a perfect tank in which to put the fish, and if it is covered with a piece of board it will not freeze during the day. It can be enlarged to any size as the fish are caught. The modern fisherman is sparing of the time-honored bottle. He has discovered that coffee or chocolate are infinitely more warmth-giving and sustaining, at the same time giving an extra zest for the fish broiled over the fire when fresh caught.

While the New Jersey lakes are universally held to be the best spots for ice fishing, it is good fun in almost all the streams and ponds of Long Island, Connecticut, and Westchester and Orange Counties. An advertisement in one of the fishing papers of a good spot will bring any number of replies from novices in the art; while the fish men at the New York markets, if properly approached, will often put a stranger on to a good thing.—New York Sun.

A Chinese Legend.

"Very many years ago," said a Chinese fortune teller, "there was a red-headed Chinaman in China. He lived there so long ago that no one now living had ever seen him. Chew Fut was his name, and he was tall and fair of complexion. For some cause not pleasing in the eyes of one of the numerous gods, Chew Fut was known all over north China, where he lived and grew to manhood.

"One day it was disclosed to a few of the faithful that this particular Chinese with the red hair must die, but it was not explained by the deity why. It is not known to this day why the order was disobeyed, for no steps were taken to end the life of Chew Fut, and so a fearful vengeance was wrecked on the people. A terrible earthquake occurred, and the waters of the sea overflowed the land, engulfing thousands of inhabitants, who were carried out to sea by the receding waters and drowned.

"The red haired Chinese was lost at the same time, and it is believed was transported direct to the infernal regions, where he must always suffer fearful torture."—San Francisco Examiner.

May Men Shed Tears?

"Is it weak in a man to shed tears?"

"Sooner mayst thou trust thy purse to a professional pickpocket than give loyal friendship to the man who boasts of eyes to which the heart never mounts in dew. Only when man weeps he should be alone—not because tears are weak, but because they should be sacred."—Bulwer Lytton.

"Tears spring from no weak and woman source, but flow from the loftiest of emotion. Tears befit a warrior when his troops desert him—a patriot when his countrymen rush to their doom—a father when his children rebel against his love."—Lytton.

"There is a sacredness in tears. They are not the mark of weakness, but of power. They speak more eloquently than ten thousand tongues. They are messengers of overwhelming grief, a deep contrition, and of unspeakable love."—Washington Irving.

Eugenie as a Godmother.

It is said that the ex-Empress Eugenie has more godchildren than any other person in the world; they number, or rather did number 3,000. It came about in this way: The Emperor had decided that he would be godfather and the Empress that she would be godmother to all legitimate children born on March 16th.

In accordance with these instructions, on the following day the births of 3,600 children were registered in the office of the Prefect of the Department of the Seine as godchildren of Napoleon and Eugenie. After her husband's death the Empress assumed the obligations of the Emperor toward the children for whomohe had been godfather.

An Alpaca Revival.

Last summer nearly all our silks were in striped patterns. This year they will probably be checked or plaided, as they were the year previous, but taffetas will be the popular wear, no matter what design is. Blue bids fair to become one of the favorite colors, particularly the delft and turquoise blues, and alpacas of all shades are to be worn. This last is blessed news, for if there was ever a fabric designed for rough and tumble use, to eschew rain and shed dust, to go through sorching weather and dripping days, the name of it is writ large, Al-