

turbing questions have been introduced by the Reform party or the Roman Catholic element in this country. Is that any evidence that the Protestant element desire to keep up strife? Who introduced the home rule resolution?

An hon. MEMBER. Who voted for them?

Mr. SPROULE. Who introduced the resolution concerning the Coronation Oath? Who introduced the New Brunswick school question and the Manitoba school question? Who is introducing the question before us to-day? These questions have always been introduced by the party opposite or by the Roman Catholic element; they have always been introduced by these people who declare they desire to live in peace and harmony with their fellow-citizens. Is that an evidence of it? And because we oppose the introduction of such questions, and because we vindicate the rights of the people, we are declared to be firebrands, to be bordering on hydrophobia, to be unworthy of respect, to be fanning the flame of religious and racial strife. Those are the epithets that are heaped upon us, and I want the country to know it, so that the people will be able to estimate at their proper value the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite who blame us for what they alone are responsible. We desire to live in peace and harmony with every son of Adam with whom we are brought into contact and especially with our fellow-Catholic subjects. We have no feeling of antipathy against them, no feeling of prejudice. We desire to live in amity with them; but when our rights are assailed, are we to be blamed because we defend them? When you tramp on a worm it will turn, and so will the yellow dog Orangeman. But is this sentiment to which is being given so wide-spread expression to-day confined to the Orange element? Need I point to the Reform party in the city of Toronto, which passed a resolution condemning the government for the introduction of this vexed question. Need I point to the resolution passed at a public meeting at Medicine Hat in the Northwest Territories to the same effect? Need I point to the resolution passed at Moosejaw by a public meeting called for the purpose of considering this question and composed of Reformers and Conservatives alike? They all, with one unanimous voice, condemn this government for its course with regard to this educational clause. Need I point to the petitions that have come here from all over the country, signed very often in equal numbers by Reformers and Conservatives alike, condemning the government? Need I point to the 'Globe' newspaper, that great organ of public opinion, which has constantly and intelligently condemned the government for what they have done, from the day they introduced this measure until the present? Need I point to all these as an evidence that the sentiments expressed by the other side

are not those which are entertained by the people? It is not the sentiment of the Orange element of the Conservative party which I am expressing, but of the great mass of the people of this country, composed of Reformers and Conservatives. That being the case, it is time for this abuse to stop. We are told that the people are misled with regard to this question. Well, I have here the statement made by one hon. member who says the people are misled. I have here the statement of Mr. Crawford—I do not know what constituency he represents.

An hon. MEMBER. Portage la Prairie.

Mr. SPROULE. That hon. gentleman says:

I thought that there was being established in the Northwest Territories what the people have in their minds to-day, and that is Roman Catholic church schools. I oppose that as strongly as any one. I would not stand for it a minute, but we have nothing of the kind. The very opposite is the condition, and I am prepared, as I think every Orangeman in Canada should be, if he lived up in that country, to support this.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Crawford says that we are not given by this Bill what the people understand in Ontario as separate schools, and that if we were, he would oppose it as much as anybody. They are not, he says, church schools or separate schools. But what does the Minister of Justice say? Here is what he says with regard to the Bill:

My object was really to apply section 93 of the British North America Act, which is applicable to every province in the Dominion, to these new provinces. That was my object and to confirm the people of those Territories in those rights and privileges mentioned in section 93, which they now enjoy.

Then he goes on to say with regard to his understanding of it:

In my judgment, section 93 of the British North America Act would bring in all the rights and privileges which exist in favour of denominational schools in the Territories at the present time or on the 1st of July coming. These rights and privileges would include all those in favour of denominational schools which are covered by section 11 of the statute of 1875.

He would include all those rights and privileges, and those rights and privileges that are covered by section 11 of the Act of 1875 mean separate schools exactly as they exist in the province of Quebec or separate schools as they exist in Ontario. That is what the Minister of Justice intended.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like my hon. friend not to construe my intention but to confine himself to my words. I would prefer that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have read them already.