

given. But within the last few days we have seen that somebody has been consulted, some other high functionary, not belonging to this House and not belonging to this state, and having no right to interfere in the affairs of the state. We find that he has been consulted with regard to the educational provisions of this Bill. Three or four times, possibly half a dozen times during the debate, the right hon. gentleman was challenged and dared and defied to deny that this clause had been submitted to the ablegate in this Dominion of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. And he was silent, he made not a word of denial when the statement was made across the floor of this House. That statement involved neither more nor less than a direct charge that there was an interference, an unjustifiable interference by that church with the state. If the right hon. gentleman does not deny it we can only presume that it was because he could not deny it. Having only the silence of the right hon. gentleman to guide us in regard to this important question, we can only assume the facts to be as they have been stated, viz: That, while the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was afraid to take the dictum of the people of the Northwest Territories in the election of 1904 upon the question, while he concealed the real issue from them, refusing to consult their representative, while he was quiet on the question until they had a larger representation in this House, while he did not consult the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), though the Minister of the Interior says he knew about all the other provisions of the Bill, while he did not consult the other representatives in this House from that territory and did not consult the delegation, we find—and I regret to say it—that the right hon. gentleman consulted and conferred with, and submitted these clauses to the ablegate of the Roman Catholic hierarchy whose power was to be affected by the clauses of this Bill. Now that fact being proven, it being proven beyond contradiction, because the right hon. gentleman does not deny it, then I say we are face to face with a crisis. We are face to face with a state of things which is not tolerable, and which the people of Canada will not tolerate, and are not tolerating to-day. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to rise and cry, peace, and toleration, and moderation of speech, when their leader has himself thrown down the gauntlet which has aroused so much passion and prejudice throughout this land on this question of religious instruction in the Northwest Territories. It cannot be that hon. gentlemen can cry, peace, peace, when there is no peace. They themselves have dragged into this House a question which they must have known from past experience would at once engender feelings throughout this country which they deprecated in 1896, feelings which they deprecated so strongly

MR. BOYCE.

that it helped them to obtain power, and a position in which they could for ever make a lasting settlement of these vexed questions. The right hon. gentleman had an opportunity to prove his words by his deeds. He had an opportunity to show to the people of Canada that what he said in 1891, in 1894, in 1895 and in 1896, he would carry out and thus establish his claim to the confidence of the Canadian people. Sir, it is said to-day by a large number of Canadians—I grant a large number of them are of that class characterized by hon. gentlemen opposite as renegade Liberals—it is said by that type of renegade Liberals who supported the hon. gentleman in 1896 and who trusted his word, that he obtained power then by false pretences; it is said by them that he advocated certain principles upon which he obtained power, and that now, on the very first opportunity given him to show that his opinions were genuine and his convictions steadfast, he has gone back on them all, and has introduced a measure containing a clause which is absolutely opposed to all the principles and professions which he then uttered. He has cast to the winds the principles which he then clamored for so earnestly in order to obtain power. Every day that this clause is insisted upon, a clause which will undoubtedly fasten upon the Northwest provinces a distasteful system of education every day does he depart from and abjure the principles which he advocated in the House and on the hustings in 1895 and 1896. What is the secret of this passion and prejudice that is raised by this question? It comes from the fact that there has been, as the people of this country believe, a betrayal of trust in regard to this same principle. Had the leader of the government been true to those professions, he would have left the matter of education entirely to the provinces themselves, and have allowed them to establish such a system as they think best suited to their circumstances. But instead of that he has chosen rather to bring a sword, and with the first blow of the sword he lops off everything he contended for in 1896. If there has been an interference with the prerogatives of this parliament by the representative of any church, I care not which church, even though it were my own church—if there has been an interference and a combination between the representative of the state and the representative of a church, then I say it is time for the people of Canada to become alive to the situation. It ill becomes hon. gentlemen opposite to say that we should be calm, that we should be tolerant, that we should allay excitement, in face of the measure which is now sought to be forced through parliament.

Toleration is desirable at all costs, toleration is much to be encouraged, as intolerance is to be deprecated. But I say there may come a time when toleration is not possible when burdens are placed upon