

lient points so that before they are called upon to make up their minds to it, they may have the information necessary. I submit that it was not a lucid explanation of the Bill which my right hon. friend gave but an impassioned argument in its behalf. On the one hand he professed the greatest concern that no old cries should be renewed, that no old issues should be called up, that the demon of discord, which had been laid in 1896, should not be roused again at this time, but I submit that the argument he used when he came to that clause was one he should not have made had he desired to live up to his profession. On what ground did the right hon. gentleman advocate his Bill? It was not explanation but an argument which he gave? He advocated it on the ground that separate schools were superior to public free schools or secular schools. He raised an issue which there was no need of raising at all, an issue which, in the earlier part of his speech, my right hon. friend declared he did not intend to raise. But he forgot that intention and he raised the question of the respective merits of public free schools and separate schools, and gave the horrible example of the United States as an argument against public schools. There you have his argument and his illustration. He tortured the British North American Act of 1867 and the British North America Act of 1871 in order to get a legal ground—what for? For an explanation of his Bill? No, but to make strong his argument for the passage of his Bill. He tortured the shades of George Brown of illustrious memory, until I could almost hear the squeaking ghost of that eminent statesman fitting through the passages here, tortured and injured by the violent wrenching and twisting which the right hon. gentleman gave it. And in all these ways, instead of making a lucid explanation of the main feature of his Bill, he entered into an impassioned argument in order that his Bill might gain the assent of this House and the country. Well, the right hon. gentleman has had to eat the fruits of his mistake. Just then, under the glamour of his speech, under his successful avoidance of certain points, under his equally successful exclusion of certain other points in that Bill, every man behind him applauded to the echo; and if a vote had been called for then, every man would have risen to his feet—perhaps with one exception—and have voted for the Bill. He rushed the House for the time being, but he failed to rush it permanently; and the disorganization and confusion of these ten days is abundant proof that the right hon. gentleman went further than prudence and good statesmanship justified. He taunted my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Borden) with deftly shaping his course. Well, I hope his course is more deftly shaped than that of my right hon. friend. He lightly told my hon. friend that he was seeking for hills of vantage and

strategical points, forsooth. There are hills of vantage but there are also valleys of humiliation. And it would be interesting to know who will head the procession through the valley of humiliation. Will it be the sturdy young Napoleon of the west with downcast eyes and drooping colours? Or will it be my right hon. friend who in 1895 boasted that he possessed the courage which did not promise until he had made up his mind, but once his promise was made stood immovable as a rock.

Now, all these are questions which we cannot but be interested in—questions raised in this House and in the country. There is one other thing. Shall I speak of it? Not content with rushing his Bill, not content with throwing aside his colleagues to rush his Bill, not content with proceeding without taking care to ascertain the sentiment of the west, not content with making his speech on the merits of the Bill and confounding it with a lucid explanation of the measure, the right hon. gentleman tried to rush the country as well. One of his colleagues in another place prepared a pamphlet, a remarkable pamphlet in some ways. It purported to be a 'brief history, from official sources, of the legislation respecting the separate schools since the year 1863 in the united province of Canada, and in the Dominion since confederation.' Now, as I said before, I have no fault to find, nor has any one in this House with the publication by the government of official information that will shed light upon this question. But this pamphlet is a partisan pamphlet. It does give the facts taken from 'Hansard,' but it does also colour them, and it does also argue the points involved. How does it colour them? I do not suppose, for instance, that Edward Blake or George Brown, or any of these old worthies, some of whom have passed away, others of whom are still with us, in making their speeches, italicized certain parts of them, or altered them in double-leaded columns, to make the arguments impressive. But in the quotations from the speeches of these gentlemen every sentence that favours the contention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is italicized or given emphasis which points the argument. It is not necessary for me to go into details. But when it comes to George Brown's momentous sentence, the maker of this pamphlet is not satisfied with italicizing it, but he puts it in bolder type, italicizes it and double-spaces it, in order that it may catch the eye and make the impression the compiler intended to make. And, when that is all done, here is the argument with which it ends—not a quotation from Blake or Brown, not an abstract from 'Hansard,' but an argument from the pen of the maker of this pamphlet:

Under the Territorial legislation, the rights of the minority have in the past been recognized. It would be a breach of faith and a violation of the British North America Act to dis-