

this parliament to provide for use against Alberta and Saskatchewan, the sword that he had used his power to prevent being drawn, in Manitoba; not because there had been no school privileges in Manitoba in 1870, that was not the question in 1896; the question in 1896 was solely that Manitoba having granted a privilege and taken it away, it was the duty of parliament to intervene. Well, Sir, the Conservative party of that day, not because they were partial or friendly to separate schools, but in the exercise of their duty, took their lives in their hands, and attempted to do justice in accordance with the terms of the constitution, but were prevented by the right hon. gentleman and his party.

That, Sir, is the position in which they stood, not as one would infer from the quotation I have just read. I said the right hon. gentleman stood in the path and prevented justice being done to the Catholic minority at that time. I desire to quote in support of what I have said the language of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) on the 24th of March. Speaking of the attempt of the Conservative government to do justice to the minority and to carry out the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in England he said:

They failed in that attempt, and why did they fail? They failed because the right hon. gentleman who leads this government stood in their way. That is the reason why they failed.

Those are not my words; those are the words of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The Conservative government were prevented from doing justice to the Roman Catholic minority by the leader of the present government. Well, the right hon. gentleman knows the bitterness and strife and trouble that then arose, he knows the part he took on that occasion; he knows how he addressed meetings and led his party in the sacred name of provincial rights. He knows how he cried, 'no coercion,' 'hands off Manitoba.' He and those behind him who are so anxious to do justice now; even the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), who talks of the Bill of Rights, and of justice; they refused in 1896 to have justice done, and why? These gentlemen, in 1896, were ambitious. They had long been in opposition, they saw an opportunity to get place and power; on the one hand were their ambitions, on the other Catholic rights; and which went to the wall? In the one scale were the ambition and political prospects of the right hon. gentleman; in the other scale were the rights of his people; and which weighed the heavier? The scale with the rights of his people tipped the beam, and the right hon. gentleman has sat ever since as leader of the government of Canada. That is the story of 1896, and if the right hon. gentleman has any other explanation of it he has never yet given it to my knowledge. If the right hon. gentleman in 1896 could cry out

MR. BARKER.

against coercion, is he now going to coerce Alberta, will he lay violent hands on Saskatchewan, and will he trample provincial rights beneath his heel? Which position is he going to take? Does he suppose that if he stood on the rock in 1896 he can stand on the rock now and enforce clause 4 which he is introducing in this Act? Would any man, with his record, have the audacity to do that, and are we to suppose that hon. gentlemen behind him will follow him if he attempts it? What is to be the result of it all? We will have in the new provinces an Act which is unenforceable; we will have the old question over again, the appeal for remedial laws and the old heartburning, strife and trouble, all because the right hon. gentleman does not choose to apply, just as it is, the law of the land, the British North America Act. If the British North America Act, section 93 and its subclauses or any of the subclauses apply to Alberta and to Saskatchewan, let them be applied, and let the people abide by them. They entered this Dominion in 1870 subject to the provisions of that Act, give them their Act and they can find no fault, but do not substitute another Act for it and tell them you are giving them what is just as good. That is not for us to judge; it is not for us to tell them whether the conditions are as good or better. Our duty is to simply apply the law. They are entitled to the law, it is their birthright, and we have no right to refuse to give it, or to give them anything instead. And as to the Roman Catholic minority, I say they have appealed to the right hon. gentleman for bread and he is giving them what he knows to be a stone. They can never derive any benefit from this legislation, and the only result to this Dominion will be the old strife and quarrelling and bad blood of 1896 between neighbours and friends. For these reasons. I think, Sir, I am justified in opposing the measure of the right hon. gentleman.

MR. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, I regret that physically I am not in that condition to discuss this question which I would like to be in, but I felt, Sir, that I could not give a silent vote upon this all-important question. The proposition brought before the House by the First Minister is too great, too comprehensive, too far-reaching, for me to give a silent vote in this House upon it. I have no apology to make for the vote that I am about to give when I vote for the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition. I have no apology to make for the observations I intend to offer or for the reasons that impel me to vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition except that I hope that I may give utterance to no sentiment, that no expression may drop from my lips, that can wound the feelings of the most sensitive. I agree with the Minister of Justice and those who have preceded me, that this discussion has