

was called in the city of Toronto, a public meeting of citizens for the purpose of considering the very question we are now discussing in this House. We do not find that Conservatives were invited to attend that meeting and take part in it. We find that at that meeting a letter written by Mr. Goldwin Smith was read. I shall read that letter to the House.

Though I cannot be with you personally, at the meeting on the school question, my hearty sympathy is with you. A great question, vital to our constitution and our civilization, has been thrust upon us. Let it be clearly and unequivocally settled. If the party politicians will not do this for us, let it be done by the people.

I intend a little later on to say something about the so-called blatant mob in Toronto. I do not suppose any hon. gentleman opposite will accuse Goldwin Smith of being a part of a blatant mob or a bigot or a fanatic. Mr. Goldwin Smith is a personal friend of the Prime Minister's and a gentleman who walked hand in hand with him in the commercial union days.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And still believes in it and they do not.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, a gentleman who has always supported this government and its policy. Then there was another gentleman who could not be present at that meeting, but I shall not detain the House by reading a letter which he sent to the meeting. That gentleman was the mayor of Toronto, the gentleman who ran in opposition to the present member for North Toronto in the last federal election, a Liberal through and through. He felt called upon to protest and did protest and his letter will be found in the published report of that meeting in the press. Then the next gentleman whose name I saw was Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, who is a Grit of the Grits. His name was before the public in the last provincial election as Liberal candidate for North Toronto. He came to the meeting which selected Mr. Blain, and explained that it was only because his doctor said he was in too poor health that he did not accept the nomination. Mr. Caldecott is so strong a Grit that I have never in my experience ventured to discuss politics with him. He is altogether too decided in his opinions. Well, he spoke at that meeting and his sentiments were in accord with those of the other speakers. The next gentleman who spoke was Mr. J. S. Willison, formerly editor of the 'Globe,'—the gentleman who wrote the biography of the right hon. the First Minister. And no more warmer friend or greater admirer of the right hon. gentleman exists than Mr. Willison. Mr. Willison spoke next to the same effect as the others. Then I find that the next speaker was Dr. Goggin. In the course of his remarks, Dr. Goggin said :

I take it that we meet here to-night as a body of Liberals, intent upon setting before our party our views on this subject, whether they be right or wrong. This I believe is one of the qualifications of a good party man. We are not here as a body of Conservatives intent upon making capital for ourselves. We are not here as a body of Orangemen trying to arrest Romanism. We are not here as representatives of the various churches to protest against the action of our brothers in the Roman communion. But we are meeting here simply and solely as citizens of the city of Toronto, with patriotic interest in the welfare of our fair Dominion.

Then I come to the next gentleman who took an active part in that meeting, and whom I find described in this report as Dalton McCarthy's nephew. I presume the reason he was thus described is the high regard which the people of Toronto have for the late Dalton McCarthy and his great attainments. I need not read what his nephew said, because his views are well known to the House. The next gentleman who spoke was Mr. D. E. Thompson, K.C.—I cannot remember of any one political campaign in Toronto in which Mr. Thompson did not take an active or prominent part as an advocate of the Liberal cause. I do not suppose that in all his career he ever cast a Conservative vote. He is one of the ablest lawyers in the city of Toronto; and unless he were thoroughly convinced of the soundness of his opinions, he would not have attended that meeting. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Thompson said :

The Laurier government came into power on the Manitoba school question. The question of autonomy had been before them four years and they knew what they were doing. What I want to know is why, if they were going to take this serious step in reference to education, the electorate was not taken into their confidence.

Three other gentlemen addressed that meeting, who are clergymen. I do not propose to judge of what type of politics these gentlemen are. In my opinion a clergyman should have no politics, or at least he should not express himself openly on questions of a party character except on a very rare and special occasion. The three clergymen who spoke were the Rev. Dr. Milligan, the Rev. Canon Cody and the Rev. Dr. Potts. I do not know what are the politics of any of these gentlemen, but I know that Dr. Milligan was a great personal admirer of the Hon. G. W. Ross. I know that Mr. Ross attended his church, and I do not think he had anything to complain of very often regarding the actions of this government. Dr. Milligan said :

Concerning the deliverance from Ottawa a month ago, the reverend speaker said it came like a thunder clap from a clear sky, considering the attitude of the Liberals in 1896.

The Rev. Canon Cody said :

A simple solution would be the best and the obvious one is to keep this tangled question