

or lack of principle of stamping out the French language and race he ventured to say would never be carried into effect. The McCarthy party so far had developed into a head and a tail—he did not know that they were going to attain any more than at present.

Then he said :

They could not go down in a better cause than that of an attempt to preserve the contracts between the minorities and majorities and to maintain the sacred compact of the constitution.

He went down six months afterwards upon that, and we will hear later how he let go of that which he went down on. On December 18, speaking at Caledon East, he said :

Mr. McCarthy had said parliament was not bound to redress the grievance. The parliament of Canada had power to refuse to remedy the grievance, but there was a deeper question than that. Nothing could be superior to the parliament technically speaking, but there was a higher power than the legislative body of Canada—that eternal sense of justice and right which a parliament might, but which no British parliament ought to outrage.

Speaking at Charleston, on December 19, he said :

After pointing out in strong terms the weakness of Mr. McCarthy, and how impossible it was for him to accomplish anything—he said : ' Put in Mr. Stubbs if you like, and how many will there be ? Three. How many members are there in parliament ? Two hundred and fifteen. It is not often the tail wags the dog, but in this instance that tail will not be even the tail of the dog.

Those are the speeches of the hon. gentleman. Those are the methods by which he opposed us when we were asking Cardwell to endorse that plank in the platform which I have read. Then follows the meeting of this House. I do not need to dwell upon what occurred then when that hon. gentleman and some of his followers bolted in and out of the government. Suffice it to know that we have heard in another chamber the history of that disgraceful event. We know that Sir Mackenzie Bowell says that the hon. member for North Toronto was the chief of the nest of traitors, and, Sir, I think that in so saying he rightly described him. I do not want to use language which I might be sorry for, but this is a certain justification for me, when I know what occurred in 1895, and when I have had to read, as I have read and re-read, the bitter, venomous attacks the hon. member for North Toronto saw fit to make upon my respected uncle.

Mr. BARR. Oh, oh.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) laughs. Let him take that back to Dufferin. He should remember that Cardwell is a part of Dufferin still.

Mr. BARR. Let the hon. gentleman go to Dufferin.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have been there before.

Mr. BARR. You did not make much progress.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Well, we won on two occasions ; not a bad record. Then parliament met. Sir Charles Tupper was the Prime Minister ; he formed his cabinet and attempted to push the Coercion Bill through, and from that time on a great many speeches were made in the House. The position of the hon. member for North Toronto was well defined. That brings us down to 1896. The government went to the country, and the country refused to endorse the coercion policy. In that election we certainly were, in the province of Ontario, denouncing the government because of its coercion policy. The Liberals, on the other hand, were saying : Return us to power, and by methods of conciliation we will settle this question. The Conservatives made it clear that they intended, if returned, to pass the Remedial Bill. The country returned the Liberals, and some kind of a settlement was made which was placed on the statute-book of Manitoba in evidence of its being a settlement. To my amazement, I heard things yesterday that I had never heard before or dreamed of. It appears that there are some difficulties and disputes yet in regard to this question. There seem to be difficulties among the members of the church in the province of Quebec which I never knew of until yesterday. But I do not think that any hon. gentleman will seriously say that the school question has formed a controversial question in politics from 1897 down to 1905.

On the 21st February last the Bill which is now before the House was introduced. It contained clause 16. It contained a clause which did effectually fasten upon the new provinces, in my opinion, separate schools. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced it in a very eloquent speech. He justified it upon grounds that I cannot agree with. He maintained that the constitution required him to do it, but nevertheless he justified it on grounds of policy ; he said he was in favour of separate schools, that the minority were entitled to them, and it was in the best interests of the country that this clause should be enacted. He made that very plain. Nobody can doubt or dispute that. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), true to the traditions of his party, spoke on that occasion, and I call the attention of the House to these words, in view of what has been said in respect to the immoderate language which it is alleged was heard upon that occasion. The hon. leader of the opposition said :

The subject which the right hon. gentleman mentioned last, on which he spoke with great eloquence, and in a spirit of forbearance and moderation, will undoubtedly invite discussion.