

gether with these sentiments: but I say that these sentiments are those cherished by a large section of the people of Ontario, people who are reasonable and sensible, and from whom this agitation comes.

The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) in discussing this question the other night, showed himself to be in an apologetic frame of mind. He felt called upon to apologize from his place in this House and to the people in other parts of the country especially for the city of Toronto, because of the position it has taken upon this question. Sir, I have no doubt that the people of Toronto felt very much relieved after that hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) had made his apology. The people of that great city, I have no doubt, were downcast, they went about with their heads down and feeling very glum. But, after the hon. gentleman had made his apology on their behalf they would make up their minds that the situation was improving and that they might attend the horse show and enjoy themselves. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) in continuing thought his apology as applied to the whole of Ontario, was too general, and he gave us to understand that all the fanatical people were to be found within the limits of the city of Toronto. Now, Mr. Speaker, the population of Toronto is made up almost wholly of native Canadians, and of natives of the province of Ontario at that. Toronto is not a composite city, it is a Canadian city. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Toronto do not differ in sentiment and opinion, at any rate so far as this question is concerned, from the people of the rest of the province of Ontario. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) tried to lead the members of this House to believe that the educational clauses in this Bill were satisfactory to the people of this province and to the people of his constituency. One hearing or reading the hon. gentleman's speech would come to the conclusion that the people of the riding of North Ontario and the people of the whole province of Ontario were crying out to have these clauses enacted in the Bill. Of course, I do not pretend that these were the hon. gentleman's words, but no other idea could be taken from his observations than the one I have given. As I have said before, it would be far better if hon. members on the other side of the House would tell their colleagues and the people generally the exact position of affairs in Ontario so far as this question is concerned. The hon. member for North Ontario went so far as to speak of the people who had sincere views on this question and who are moderate and reasonable people as a 'blatant mob.' He wanted his colleagues in this House and the people in other parts of the country to understand that when these people spoke on this sub-

ject they were like a lot of calves bellowing—for that is the meaning of his words. I repeat that it would do much better if hon. gentlemen opposite would speak out and state what is the sentiment in Ontario. Of course, anything that I might say on this point would in all probability have but little influence with hon. gentlemen opposite. But perhaps they will listen to the leading organ of the Liberal party in Ontario. What the 'Globe' says on this subject may sink deeper into their minds and hearts. On the 19th of April the 'Globe' had a leading editorial on this subject, and I propose to take up your time in reading this short article in case it may have escaped the attention of hon. members. It bears the significant caption, 'In a Fool's Paradise,' and is as follows:

Those who suppose that opposition to the educational clauses in the Northwest Autonomy Bills is confined to Toronto, and that it is dependent on Orange-Toryism for its vitality, are living in a fool's paradise. It may be that the noisiest clamour is being made by Toronto Tories and by newspapers catering for ultra-Protestant and Tory or quasi-Tory support. But such opposition is utterly without significance, and may safely be disregarded both by the public and by parliament. And it may be, too, that public opinion on this and other questions is represented as inadequately and as uncertainly in a Toronto club as in the lobbies and smoking rooms of the House of Commons. That point need not be argued.

But the point of capital importance, and which cannot be disproved by shutting one's eyes to its undesired existence or by shouting bravely that it does not exist, is the unmistakable fact that not in Toronto alone but in scores of centres throughout this province the sanest and steadiest and most intelligent men cannot bring themselves to approve of the Dominion parliament, on any pretext whatsoever, interfering in the educational affairs of the new provinces. The men who make this objection are not Tories. They are not Orangemen. They are Liberals. They are, some of them, the men who give virility and prestige to Liberalism in their constituencies, and without whom there would be no Liberal party worthy of the name. To ignore the fact of their opposition, to minimize its significance, or to misunderstand its quality is to play the part of children in a situation which demands the wisdom and courage of men.

Another delusion is the notion that this significant opposition is wholly based upon racial or religious prejudices. There are, to be sure, race and creed fanatics here and there throughout Ontario whose occupation would be gone and whose enjoyment of life would be destroyed were they unable periodically to raise a scare about French Canadian domination or the aggression of the hierarchy. But there is no endurance in any opposition they may excite; and if the present controversy is politically abortive it will, in a large measure, be due to the revolt from the part played by the leading organs of anti-French and anti-Catholic fanaticism. The opposition that counts, however, and that will survive when the frenzy of the professional fire-eaters is past, is the deliberate and convinced opposition of the men in dominantly Protestant constituencies who have never