

occasion requires, to rebuke some of the sentiments which have been given utterance to by the members on his own side of the House. They pledge themselves to use every legitimate means to drive the hon. member from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington) from public life, and my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), if they venture to vote against the amendment. And this is to be the issue in this country,—creed against creed, and political parties are to divide on a cleavage of that kind. And the gentleman who must acknowledge the paterinity of this sort of thing stands up in the House and says he wants peace, and blames us for setting the heather afire, for stirring up passion and creating bad blood among the people. And then there was the appeal made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I was simply astonished at the audacity of his ground and lofty tumbling the other day. In 1896 he was the most eloquent champion of minority rights, not merely because they were guaranteed by the constitution, but because they were right and because majorities should be fair and just to minorities. He made one of the most moving and eloquent speeches ever delivered in this House along those lines. If those principles were sound then they are right to-day. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had the audacity to rise in his place in this House and say: Well, the elections of 1896 took place and the Liberals were returned to power, so, my arguments do not seem to have had the effect they ought to have had with the people; and the same was repeated in 1900 and again in 1904; and therefore I am going to swallow my principles, I am going over to the other side. Well, if that logic were sound, the hon. gentleman ought to come clean over to this side of the House and not divide opinion with us on this question alone. The hon. gentleman knew, perfectly well, when he spoke, that the elections of 1896 were not decided on the Manitoba school question. He knew, that for years the people of Canada groaned under a bad policy and a worse administration. He knew that four or five years before 1896, the people of Canada had made up their minds that at the first opportunity they would change rulers and change methods of government in this country; had made up their minds that they would put men in office pledged to an entirely different policy in the administration of affairs. He knew that the Manitoba school question had little to do with the verdict of the people. And he ought to have known that again in 1900, after four years' experience of Liberal policy and Liberal rule, moderate protection and progressive administration, the country had gone ahead by leaps and bounds, and that the people were satisfied. Yet the hon. gentleman stands up in the House and says that in 1900 the people of Canada voted against separate schools, and there-

fore he hastens to abandon the defence of minority rights on the ground that they were right and to get over to what he conceives to be the strong side. Mr. Speaker, that seems to me a simply awful position for a leading public man in this country to take. I do not wish to follow the hon. gentleman or to imitate the kind of language he has indulged in, but on two occasions in this House upon a question germane to this he made what I consider a straight appeal to the prejudices of the people. Well, speaking about prejudices it is not for me to advise the great Conservative party, though it has gone back upon every principle that its great leaders laid down—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PARMELEE. Upon every occasion in the past when this question came before parliament, every Conservative leader worthy of the name has taken much the position of the Liberal party under the leadership of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is taking to-day. Everybody who is familiar with the history of this country knows that to be the case. But, as I say, it is not for me to advise them—this is their funeral. But I do say that in a country situated as this is, no man can rise to the highest position in the councils of the nation unless he is broad enough to stand up in this House and everywhere and plead for equal rights for all the people.

Now, I promised to be brief, and I have already spoken longer than I intended. But, before I sit down, I would like to make one appeal in contrast and in contradistinction to some of the appeals that have been made. I would appeal to the sense of fairness of the Protestant people of Canada. As one of themselves and as representing an element treated most generously by a Catholic and French Canadian majority, I would like to ask them if we should be outdone in the desire to live and let live, if we should be outdone in the desire to manifest Christian charity and Christian toleration, which, after all, are the best justification for the Protestant religion. I would like to ask them, with all these facts before them, if they are going to be scared, and if they are going to have their prejudices aroused, and if they are going to refuse to do what is right simply because for partisan purposes the Conservative party chooses to make sectarian appeals and stir up sectional strife. Well, I do not know that I should say for party purposes for one can hardly know which is the party, and which is the rump.

At any rate, what stands for the great Conservative party to-day, for the sake of making a little political capital, takes its stand against a proposition so eminently fair which is based upon the constitution and upon inherent rights. Now it seems to me that they are barking up the wrong tree. Prejudices may be aroused for a little time,