

are absolutely unanimous that it ought not to be resorted to except in cases of gross and clearly proven abuse of the power of the majority in any province, and after all other efforts to remedy the grievances have been exhausted.

Speaking to that resolution he said :

If then, Sir, in all the maritime provinces, this question has been capable of adjustment by the people concerned, are we not warranted in believing that equally happy results will follow if we allow the people of Manitoba themselves to come together, as the resolutions from which I have quoted indicate they are willing to do in a friendly conference, with a view of removing every grievance.

He was referring in his speech to the people of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. He went on, referring to the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada.

So divided did the people become over educational and other cognate matters, that government became an impossibility, and at last the great men of that day, regardless of their views, united to devise a scheme that would regulate educational and other matters of a kindred character to the local legislature rather than to the arbitrament on each occasion of the representatives of the whole people of Canada, and no one subject was with greater unanimity regarded as peculiarly proper to be dealt with by the provinces affected rather than the Dominion parliament, than was the subject of education.

In 1896 the Postmaster General laid it down as a doctrine in the speech to which I have referred that the question of education could more properly be dealt with by the provinces than by the Dominion parliament. He expressed the view which I have expressed that at all times if it is possible to keep this question of education in the different provinces out of the arena of federal politics it should be kept out of that arena. If the Postmaster General or the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who expressed exactly the same views in Nova Scotia in 1896 as this hon. gentleman expressed in Ontario, or the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) will rise in this House and say that the public had no warrant for coming to the conclusion they did in 1896 in respect to the position taken by the Prime Minister and his colleagues, then I say the campaign carried on in 1895 and 1896 was the most deceptive political campaign ever carried on in this country. The fact of the matter is that the people had it perfectly fixed in their minds that the Liberal party from the premier down were against the principle of separate schools. If when the present administration came into power that party was known to a large section of Canada as standing for or against any one principle, it was known as standing against the principle of separate schools in the west. The reason why public opinion is aroused is because the people feel that they

Mr. KEMP.

have been deceived in regard to the attitude that this government has taken upon this question; they are dissatisfied and they are disappointed with the remarks made by the Prime Minister when he introduced the Bill into this House. In his speech in moving the second reading of the Bill the Prime Minister referred to the press of the leader of the opposition and the agitation which this press was making for the purpose of stirring up strife and discord in this country. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what section of the press of the leader of the opposition is responsible for this agitation? Where is the Toronto 'Globe' on this question? Is there any paper in this country with greater influence in the Liberal party than the Toronto 'Globe'? Is not the position of the Toronto 'Globe' on this question as nearly as possible similar to the position which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has taken? And has the 'Globe' not expressed itself on different occasions as being very much opposed to the educational clauses of this Bill? Is the 'Globe' not in favour of omitting them altogether? But how could the 'Globe' take any other position than that which it has taken? How could hon. gentlemen expect the 'Globe' to take any other position? What was the position it took in 1896. Was it then not in favour of leaving the question of separate schools in Manitoba to be dealt with by that province? If hon. gentlemen will look through the files of the 'Globe' all through the agitation of 1895-96 they will see that the position of the 'Globe' at that time was in harmony with the position of the 'Globe' in 1905. I am not here for the purpose of defending the course of any particular newspaper, but a good deal has been said about another newspaper in Toronto and the gentleman who edits that paper. That gentleman edited the Toronto 'Globe' in 1896 and could the gentleman who edited that paper at that time take a different position in 1905 than that which the 'Globe' took in 1896? It may be possible that hon. gentlemen opposite may think it necessary to change around, right about face on this question, but they must not always expect every other person and newspaper to follow their lead in matters of this kind. It is interesting to analyse this question and to find out who it is who are agitating, and who are interested in the discussion of this question and whose views differ from those of the government upon it. I think as good an illustration as I can bring to the attention of the House is a protest which came from the city of Toronto a short time ago in the shape of a resolution which was passed at a public meeting. I wish to say that the protest and the agitation and the bigots and the fanatics so called by hon. gentlemen opposite are members of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario. On March 20th, 1905, a meeting