

That is another reason he gave for supporting the Bill. For myself I do not see anything in any of these petitions that would induce any member of this House to support the Bill before parliament at the present time; I think the very reverse is the case. I said in the beginning that this Bill had caused more contention than any other Bill that has been before this House since I have had the honour of a seat in it, and I think that is true. We had notice to-day from a gentleman in this House that there was going to be a large number of public meetings all over this country in the near future. There was a large public meeting in Toronto a few days ago, a good many speakers took part, and I judge from what I see reported that they were all Liberals except one, and he was an independent, I suppose, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy). He said he was an independent, and I am bound to take his word for it. The gentleman who occupied the chair at that meeting is a Liberal, I think no person who lives in Toronto and knows anything about the public men there will dispute that he is a Liberal of the Liberals. I refer to Mr. Stapleton Caldecott. He said himself before the meeting was over that as Paul called himself, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, so he, Mr. Caldecott, was a Grit of the Grits. He is reported to have said:

We must make no mistake, and if we pass the clause as brought before us by Sir Wilfrid Laurier we should make a most tremendous mistake. (Hear, hear). What he proposes is open to most serious objection, and for myself, with my previous admiration for this man, giving him my hearty service as a model statesman, for the moment I have lost my respect for his judgment. (Hear, hear). He has sought, almost in an indecent manner, to thrust upon this people a piece of legislation they will never submit to. What have our Ontario cabinet ministers been doing in the meanwhile? (Hear, hear). What is the reason for their silence? Are we to take it that they are in favour of the proposal?

Well, Sir, the Minister of Customs took a fling at that gentleman, he said he did not think the First Minister would suffer much because he had lost the respect of that gentleman, but he did not respect Mr. Caldecott's judgment because, he said, a man who knew anything about parliamentary practice would know that if a minister stays in a government he must agree with the doings of that government. Well, there was another gentleman who spoke at that meeting, the hon. member for North Simcoe, (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) and let me read what he said:

Since the date of the introduction of these Bills, there has arisen a huge wave of public opinion, and would you believe it? It has reached as far as Ottawa, it was wafted there in some particular way, it has caused much ex-

citement—acute situations, resignations have taken place, and rumors of more.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under that state of things, Mr. Caldecott must not be blamed much if he did not know exactly where the Ontario ministers were of the opinion that they did not know themselves exactly where they were at first. After this Bill was introduced, any person looking over on to the other side of the House could see that there was pretty general confusion everywhere, and I think if a vote had been taken then, we would have had no Liberal government at the present time. But when the shepherd got back, you know, and when they changed the wording of the clause without changing the meaning, as a matter of course they had an excuse to come back. That is all it amounted to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are you not sorry that you did not have to vote then?

Mr. U. WILSON. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Centre York will be glad at the next election if there are a good many men in this riding who will not have votes. You may fool them once or twice, but you cannot fool them all the time. You remember that the hon. gentleman got in once on higher duties on vegetables. Then he got out of that by saying that he could not induce the government to do what he wanted them to do. I do not know what he will do the next time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He is here any way.

Mr. WILSON. That is about as good an argument as the right hon. First Minister once gave us when he said: We are here, and you are there; what are you going to do about it?

Mr. CAMPBELL. What did you do about it?

Mr. U. WILSON. We ran again and got beaten. There was another gentleman at that meeting, Dr. Goggin, who made a very strong speech. Some say he is a Tory and some say he is a Liberal. I do not know what he was or what he is, but I will read an extract from what he said, as follows:

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.

It is most unfortunate that the question was ever raised. The responsibility for the state of the public opinion now existing in the west does not rest upon the people of Ontario, or of any other province, but upon that fraction of the cabinet at Ottawa who manufactured those educational clauses for the people of the Dominion without the knowledge of those members of the cabinet most concerned therewith.