

Customs said that their party was above these things, that their party would not go so low as to seek to raise national or religious prejudices. Why, Sir, that has been their stock in trade, they never had any other policy than that. What policy have they to-day, what fiscal policy have they? Is it not the same policy that they opposed for 18 years in opposition, the policy of the Conservative party which they have changed a little, but the principle is the same? What policy have they upon provincial autonomy, or any other question? So they went to the country. In the province of Quebec they used to say that it was impossible for the minority in Manitoba to obtain a redress of their grievances because, forsooth, the Prime Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was an Orangeman; while in the province of Ontario they said that the Prime Minister was bound hand and foot to the hierarchy of the province of Quebec. This was the way they treated that question throughout Canada.

But, during all that time the Conservative party were endeavouring to do justice with a sincere desire to end this question in a way to render justice to the minority in Manitoba. They brought the question before the courts, it went to the Supreme Court and then to the Privy Council, where it was decided that the law was *intra vires* of the province of Manitoba, as they had passed the law themselves and had changed that law, but it was declared later on by the Privy Council that the minority had a grievance, and that the Dominion government, according to the British North America Act, must come to the relief of the minority. Then when the Remedial Bill was presented to parliament, what did we see? We saw the friends of those gentlemen opposite—many of them have now disappeared from the House—opposing that Bill with all their might, speaking against time, knowing that parliament must dissolve on the 24th of April. They followed the lead of my right hon. friend who had proposed the six months hoist, knowing that he was defeating the Bill, knowing that that law was good, but knowing also that he was helping his party to obtain power. That was the way that he obtained his great name among the Protestants, which he has held for so many years, the name of being a tolerant man, of being above prejudice, the name of being so liberal minded that he had put his foot upon the hierarchy in the province of Quebec. But that was not the language used in Quebec. In Quebec, his French name and his eloquence were enough to help him and his friends into power, and in that way he succeeded in overthrowing the Conservative government. Well, after he came into power what did we see? On the opening of the new parliament in the month of August, 1896, in the debate on the address, he talked about the traditions of the Liberal

Mr. BERGERON.

party, they had none to boast of. Sir Charles Tupper, who was then in opposition, declared that he had gone down to defeat because he thought that he was right in standing by the constitution of Canada in attempting to render justice to the minority of Manitoba. What did Sir Charles Tupper say? He said: My hon. friend is now in power: he has a big majority; let him bring down a Bill to render justice to the minority in Manitoba, and I pledge myself and my friends behind me to help him. There are the traditions of the party. This was not because Sir Charles Tupper believed in separate schools or because the majority of those behind him believed in them, but because it was the law of the land; it was because it would render justice, and because, as has been said before, it would be an act of cowardice on the part of any majority not to render justice to a minority, whatever that minority might be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was in the House in 1896 and followed the debate to some extent. As a matter of curiosity will the hon. gentleman point out to me where I can find in 'Hansard' the statement of Sir Charles Tupper to which he has referred?

Mr. BERGERON. I can point it out to my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and, if he wants me to do so immediately, I will send for 'Hansard.'

Mr. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) a question? He has made a declaration of policy on behalf of the party behind him. Are we to understand that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will support him in the course he speaks of?

Mr. BERGERON. I have been here twenty-four sessions, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) is not smart enough to catch me like that. I am speaking for myself and am stating what happened in 1896.

Mr. MACDONALD. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) to decline to answer that question?

Mr. BERGERON. Certainly; I am not the chief of the party.

Mr. MACDONALD. Oh, I thought you were.

Mr. BERGERON. No, thank God, I am not. I may say that I have sent for the volume of 'Hansard' containing the remarks concerning which the Minister of Justice asked and I will be able to quote them to him because they are in 'Hansard.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I take the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Bergeron) word for it.

Mr. BERGERON. It is there. I have quoted it very often in public meetings and elsewhere, for it is worth while to do so. When my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) found himself in power on the