

as would prevent any future strife, as would prevent the repetition of what happened in 1896. I say, therefore, that if you have anybody to blame, it is not the Prime Minister. If you are going so far as to take your remote damages from creation, you must blame the fathers of confederation, those who can be charged with having dropped the words 'the two Canadas,' and with having framed that particular clause. I have listened with great interest to another gentleman who poses as a great peace-maker, particularly in view of the fact that he went through the debate of 1896 and knows the whole question thoroughly. My hon. friend who has just spoken said that when the Prime Minister set himself on the rock of the constitution, he thought it was a Siftonian rock. I think when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition shelters himself behind the rock of the constitution, we might well call it a Sproule-Fosterite rock, because I do not believe the hon. gentleman of his own impulse would take the stand he has taken. Nevertheless, he has stated that he takes the stand of his own free-will and has left his flock to act as they please.

I have only one fault to find with the speech of the leader of the opposition. He clamours for provincial rights, and at the same time undertakes to suggest as good statesmanship in relation to the administration of public lands, that these lands should be given to the provinces, but that a restriction should be imposed on the provinces as to the giving of those lands as to free homesteads and as to the fixing of a price for these lands. I am not sure if I am quoting the hon. gentleman correctly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not quite correctly. I suggested that the lands should be given over to the administration of the provinces absolutely, and I said even if we could not do that, it would be wise to come to some arrangement with the people by which we would place some restriction on their method of dealing with the lands as has been suggested. That was really an alternative proposal.

Mr. BUREAU. I think if you were to give the administration of the lands to the provinces and to place restrictions on them in that administration, it would be an encroachment on provincial rights. You would be establishing a condition of things which they themselves would not enforce, that is, you would be encroaching on provincial rights, and consequently I come to the conclusion that in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite the principle of provincial rights is a good thing to shelter yourself behind when it suits you, but when it does not suit you, to the winds with provincial rights. I read with great interest a speech made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). His experience, his wide knowledge of men and politics and events in

this country, have greatly interested me in this speech. In reading that speech I tried to decide whether I was not biased, whether I could not change my views. After reading it very carefully, I found that the hon. gentleman had not treated the question at all. The speech starts out by finding fault with everybody on this side of the House—and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman did not find fault with everybody in the country. Then he is astonished at the change of front of the Prime Minister. Well, Sir, after reading and comparing the speeches of the hon. member for North Toronto in 1896 and 1905, I have come to the conclusion that all the hauling around and changing of front had been performed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In those days when he discussed the question of remedial legislation, he dismissed with a snap of his fingers the question of provincial rights. He said that:

The assertion was made in this House and in the country as well that for the Dominion parliament to attempt to legislate on this subject is to interfere with and invade provincial rights. I beg to state my humble opinion that it cannot be fairly maintained either in this House or in the country, looking to the distribution of powers by the Confederation Act where the jurisdiction is plain and unequivocal, that for this parliament to exercise its powers, to exercise its jurisdiction is to interfere with any rights that belong to the province in question at this time or of any other province, if this question touching any other province were to come up.

One of the questions to be put aside before you come to an honest conclusion is the question of provincial rights. He does not seem to think the same this year, and on reading his speech I find things there that have surprised me. I do not know if I may qualify portions of that speech as the most deliberate appeal to arms ever heard since the days of Patrick Henry. He says:

I want to ask in the first place why there should be any attempt to inject into the constitution of these new provinces the principle of separate schools.

Where is the injection, and who are the injectors? I understand that the word 'inject' means to force a foreign body through some mechanical force into another body. We do not inject anything; the injection was in 1896. The Manitoba legislature of that day had passed a law which had been declared within their powers of legislation by the highest tribunal in the land, and the Conservative government at Ottawa were endeavouring to impose on the Manitoba legislature the very contrary of that legislation. But this time the people of the Northwest, through their representatives, through their government, through their legislature, have passed a law, and of this law we have said to them: Gentlemen, this law suits you, you want the law, you made it yourselves, you can have it; there is a minority in the two new provinces, and you