

people which they cannot bear. When their rights are being encroached upon, then it is only natural that people should resist; that is the natural result where seeds of discord and seeds of coercion are sown. The right hon. gentleman himself has spoken loudly and passionately with regard to this question. He said the people were aroused, that the torch had gone through the land. Can he say less now, or are these mere dull and idle platitudes? It is he who has lighted the torch and has sent it through this land, as is evidenced by the volume and multiplicity of the petitions that are laid on the table day after day, petitions coming to this House irrespective of party, showing that the people are aroused. These petitions come, to a large extent, from former adherents of the right hon. gentleman's party in 1896, which fact is sufficient to show that he has broken faith with that party, and that he does not represent it any more on this question. This plea for toleration was loudly raised by ministers of the Crown who, it was thought, from their previous utterances, would have taken a very different stand in regard to these Bills. The cry of toleration and the cry of peace were raised by these hon. gentlemen, from whom it was thought we would have had a very much more stable line of argument. We have had from them a plea for the cessation of strife and passion. We have had the thunder of the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) against this engendering of strife and passion. In his sonorous tones, that filled this chamber, we had an appeal for moderation, and I wonder how his voice will sound when he goes back to his constituency and tries to square the remarks he made upon this Bill with what he said on a previous occasion. There is a great deal of hypocrisy about the cry of toleration. There is this much hypocrisy, that while we are asked to be tolerant, a part of the people are being muzzled and bound hand and foot by measures of a coercive character. We are asked to allay strife and passion while the people of the Northwest are being bound for all time under the slavery of a coercive law. They are asked to calmly submit to the imposition by this parliament of such measures as this parliament sees fit to impose, and if we raise our voices in opposition to this we are accused of engendering strife and passion. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) claimed that this Bill was a compromise. I fail to see in what respect it is a compromise. My conception of a compromise is that the parties interested pro and con come together, they discuss, they give way and they agree. I do not understand that this is any compromise in the ordinary acceptance of the term and the meaning which I have always seen attributed to it. It is not that kind of a compromise. It is the kind of a compromise which is inflicted on the people of the Northwest. They are told to

take it and be satisfied, and then, forsooth, it is stated across the floor of this House that it is a compromise. Then we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a final settlement of the question of education. We are told that there will be no more heart burnings, no more difficulties, no more strife and passion engendered in this country, and that the people will for ever be at rest upon this question. Sir, I fancy that there is an element among the people, a very strong element, a very eloquent element, that will differ from that proposition laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is an element of the people, and a strong and representative element, among them being the former adherents and supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, who take a very different view of the situation, and many of these will say that there is no settlement of this question except a settlement, in the words of the Minister of Justice, based upon justice. The Minister of Justice says that there will be no peace except a peace based upon justice. The justice which he meant was justice to the 41 per cent of the Roman Catholic denomination of this Dominion. That was the only justice that the hon. Minister of Justice meant. The Minister of Finance referred to the peace that we should reach in regard to all these burning questions of religion and he stated that it was not an ignoble peace that he desired, but that it was peace with honour. He did not mean the same justice. The Minister of Justice, sitting side by side with him, said that there could be no peace except it was founded upon justice to the minority, and while these hon. gentlemen are crying 'peace,' they are, by this clause, sowing the very seeds of discord in this land. The Minister of Finance urged his followers to unite upon this measure, because, forsooth, the King's government must go on. He urged them to unite because, as he said, no other government could be formed that could deal with this question. He was loudly applauded when he said that if his leader were to go out of office upon this question no other government could be formed that could deal with this question as this government is now dealing with it. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman is not blind to the pages of history. I do not know that the party that is represented in opposition in this House has been lacking in the power to deal with great questions which make for progress and prosperity in this country. If the hon. minister laid that down as a proposition, I must say that it is the first time that any one has dared to say it upon the floor of this House. Is he forgetful of all that has been done by the party which is now in opposition in this House, of all those great principles involving the progress, prosperity and protection to the people, irrespective of race or creed, in trade in national status, and in importance, and in religious toleration, that have been institut-