

understand them supporting that amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) together. Is it sufficient reason for me to know, that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Tarte), is the seconder of that amendment? Is it sufficient reason for me to know that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Martin) is a supporter of that amendment, and I a Conservative? Sir, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) spoke the other night of the Liberal-Conservative party being raked and torn asunder. Who is doing the attempt at raking and tearing it asunder? If at any stage of this Bill I may have to vote against friends of mine, I shall do it with regret, because I am in the main in harmony with the principles enunciated by the Liberal-Conservative Governments for the past 25 years. I shall do it with regret, Sir, and not with joy, while the attitude of some members of the party would lead one to think they did oppose their party with feelings of rejoicing. I will give you another reason why I am not going to vote for that amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I quote the language of the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll), who is one of his leading supporters from Quebec. Listen to what he says:

We on this side of the House support the principle of remedial legislation, a principle which ought to be put into practice.

And, again, he says:

I am against the measure because it is not coercive enough to be really beneficial and advantageous to the minority.

And then he goes on to say:

We are a united party and falling a settlement we want to intervene in this Parliament.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carroll) is followed in language such as that, by the hon. member for Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Brodeur) and by other hon. members on that side of the House. Mr. Speaker, they want something better or worse than this Bill, whichever you like to call it, but that is not going to appeal to me as a reason why I should support the leader of the Opposition.

Now, there is another reason. This matter has been before the people of this country for six years, as was called attention to by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to-night. I think, Sir, that it is about time that this question was settled, one way or the other. The six months' hoist would mean to throw it upon the political surface of the country for, possibly, another six years, in my judgment. But we will settle the question here and now, by a yea or nay vote, before we close this Parliament, and then we will settle it, I hope, for all time to come.

Mr. LISTER. Do you think this Parliament will last longer than six months?

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Government of this country is getting a good deal of talking done now by making use of the night as well as the day, and, I presume, that if they are sincere in this matter, as I have no doubt they are, we will get the work done. I do not think it would require that the House should last six months in order to get that work done.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. All right.

Mr. MULOCK. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, he proposes to vote against the resolution for the six months' hoist and also against the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. The hon. member did not hear me say anything of the kind. It is time enough when I come to a second reading to tell him about that.

Mr. MULOCK. Did not the hon. member say that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. An hon. member has no right to interrupt another hon. member in possession of the floor.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member allowed me to ask the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say to the House, that at this stage of the debate, these interruptions are not seemly.

Mr. MCGILLIVRAY. I have not said, Mr. Speaker, how I am to vote on the second reading, and it will be time enough for me to say that when the motion is put. I do not propose, Sir, taking up any further the time of this House to-night. Let me say in conclusion, Sir, that our French fellow-members, such as the last who spoke (Mr. Bechard), have no right to hurl such names and epithets as they do at us in the province of Ontario. In every contest for the last twelve years in that province, we have endeavoured, instead of destroying the separate schools, to make them better. Speaking for myself, I would rather have a national school system in its largest and broadest sense. I do not endorse the language of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he says he would rather have separate than secular schools. I would rather have the secular than the separate schools. That is my opinion, at least. Why, Sir, in the province of Ontario, before we were disturbed by the two classes of schools, we were all educated in the one school. I am old enough now to carry my mind back to that day, when, in the public schools of the country there was no religious strife. No little Catholic said an unkind thing to a little Protestant, nor a Protestant to a Catholic. We were raised together, and in our own little school in one