

clared his attitude. He is not a member of the cabinet; but I presume that he was a prospective minister. I have been waiting to hear from another gentleman who sits close to that hon. member. I refer to the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). At a by-election in that constituency, I had the honour to go there to say a word on behalf of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who was then a candidate in North Ontario. And one of the principal things brought against the hon. member for North Toronto in that campaign, was that he had supported the Remedial Bill, and if elected would advocate the granting of separate schools in the Northwest. That was the principal argument used in that by-election to further the election of the hon. member for North Ontario, and I now expect to hear from him that he will follow the hon. member for North Simcoe and declare the position he purposes taking when the Bill comes up.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington) On the motion to adjourn, moved by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and on which several members have spoken, some of whom have said that they are unalterably opposed to clause 16 of the Bills creating two new provinces in the Northwest Territories, I would say on my own behalf, speaking for myself only, that I am unalterably in favour of that clause 16 in the two Bills shortly to come up for a second reading. So far as I have been able to gather, the only point urged to-day is that made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who says that the Bills are hurried ones. Surely he does not mean that these are new Bills. I remember last session hearing this matter discussed, if not in the House at all events around the House, and likewise the session before that. They are, I submit, two of the best considered Bills that have ever been brought forward; and although they may not have been as fully discussed with some members of the government as they might have been, still I venture to say that during the past five or ten years no question has received greater consideration. If I read parliamentary practise aright, if I understand Todd's parliamentary procedure and May's usages of parliament, I believe I am correct in saying that it is the Prime Minister who should introduce measures of the kind we are now discussing; and if any of the members of his cabinet are not in accord with him, they have one duty to perform and that is to resign. If the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) found he could not support the government in this matter, he has taken the proper course; but as I understand the question, so far as it has now gone, there is a distinct desire on the part of hon. members opposite, evinced both in their speeches and their newspapers, to create some inflammatory condition in this

Mr. TAYLOR.

country which there is nothing in the Bills introduced to warrant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What about the Globe?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have read the editorials in the 'Globe,' in which that newspaper takes issue with the government regarding the educational policy laid down in the Bills presented to this House. I am sorry that the 'Globe' cannot see as the government do on this question, but the 'Globe' is only one newspaper, and we are legislating for the whole Dominion. If the 'Globe' cannot see eye to eye with us, that is no reason whatever why we should turn back from what we believe to be our duty. The majority of this House and the country, I am convinced, are of the opinion that the measure submitted to us is right and just; and in that belief I think we should go forward notwithstanding the Toronto 'Globe' and the organ of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and those other organs which are criticising these Bills very adversely at present.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want the right hon. the First Minister to forget the second question that I ventured to put to him so that he may settle, if it is in his power to do so, these disquieting rumours which have been given currency with reference to the attitude of some others of his ministers on this Bill. We have had a most important piece of information from the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He has just told us that this Bill has been discussed for two sessions, and he has informed the House with all becoming gravity that it is still being discussed. Where? Is there an inner circle somewhere?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I said around the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there a circle within a circle in the party headed by my right hon. friend, and at the head of which is probably the right hon. gentleman who leads the government? Is there an inner circle which takes up these things in advance and discusses and settles them and brings them to a point where they are in the position of not being new matters but things well discussed and settled during these two years? Last year my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was, I believe, present in this House and in his wonted health. He was also present the year before last in equally good condition. During all that time, as we have just been informed, the principles of this Bill were being discussed, and surely if any one of them was discussed it must have been that one dealing with the school question. But evidently the Minister of the Interior was not in that warm current.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. gentleman bringing up some new matters? I would