

of the west will settle one thing. Never again will a French Canadian be entrusted with the premiership of Canada; never again will a French Canadian have the opportunity to betray the people of this country. Canada cannot afford to take chances again.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have had read 'Le Soleil' and other Liberal papers, and sought to hold the government responsible for their utterances. The Prime Minister has given his answer. But here is the organ of the Tory party in the city of Hamilton, where dwells the chief organizer, as I understand it—Mr. Barker—and I ask the leader of the opposition: Is that the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party under him? Well, Sir, if it be, all I can say is that it is unworthy of any party or any paper to take such a position as that which he has taken. Sir, what is implied in it, and what is in it? That two-fifths of the people of this country can never expect to have one of their number, no matter how gifted, no matter how pre-eminent his abilities may be, to fill the first position in this land; he cannot have that position because he is a French Canadian. That is something which I think the people of my province will not endorse. That is something which the people of this country will not endorse, and I hope to hear a repudiation of that from hon. gentlemen opposite, for it will be better for them to denounce such sentiments as that. Sir, all I want to say in conclusion is this: The attempt is made by the party opposite, in order to secure power, and it is made through their press, to attack the leader of this government, knowing the strong man that he is, and believing that if they can strike him down, they might then hope to attain office, and to this end you will find such articles as I have read to you and such expressions in this House. These attacks are made in order that he may be struck and that, by striking him and by possibly weakening his power, they will weaken the party which he leads. They tell us they have succeeded to such an extent that, as one hon. gentleman told us, only two counties in Ontario would return Liberal supporters of the Liberal government—the county of Prescott and the county of Russell. They ask us: Why don't you open London? Why don't you open other constituencies?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. London is not vacant. They say we dare not open a county. I would ask them: Do they suppose that if Centre Toronto, or London, or any other single constituency in this country, was opened and was carried by them, that that would mean the inevitable return of the Conservative party to power? Sir, if it was to be decided by the verdict of a single constituency and on one question, I would say that the better place to open a constituency would be in the Northwest Territories,

where they say these people are going to be bound and shackled.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad to hear that they approve of that; I thought they could not do otherwise. If there happened to be an election there that would be a better test in reference to this question than any constituency you might open in another province. They tell us there is a departure from principle in this Bill. They say that the relations of church and state are embodied in this Bill. I would like to know how? Are these separate schools, as they are termed in the Bill, in the Northwest separate schools for Catholics alone? No; hon. gentlemen know that they are minority schools for Protestants as well as Catholics. Do you say the provinces do not want them? Then why have they kept them, as I am told they have? As was pointed out by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), while there may be a minority of the Catholic faith in the Territories, taking them as a whole, there are several localities where the Protestants are in the minority, and if in some of these they desire to have their minority schools, they are, under the law which it is proposed to continue, the law of the Territories, enacted by the legislature representing these people, enabled to have their schools and to have their religious instruction of a Protestant character and according to the Protestant faith. Where is the connection between church and state? Provincial rights! Members talk about provincial rights who have not been noted for standing up for them in the past. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who made that inflammatory speech this afternoon—and he has admitted by the reference which he made at the close that it was an inflammatory speech—gives us to understand that he is on that platform, admits that he hopes he may be able to climb into power, not, as he professed some years ago, by being in favour of securing liberty and rights to the minorities, but by being in favour of taking them away from whom? As far as he is concerned, by taking out the clauses in the Bill that now gives liberty to the minority. He told us on a previous occasion that for three successive elections this question had been fought and the Liberal party sustained, and, therefore, as long as grass grew and waters ran, he did not feel disposed to go against that will as thus three times expressed upon that question. Sir, a principle, if it is right, is right all the time. If minority rights were sacred in his eyes, as he said they were in 1896, minority rights ought to be sacred to him now, no matter how the election went. Sir, I am not going into the question; I have spoken once, and I do not want to again take the opportunity of doing so. I am replying to what hon. gentlemen opposite have said in their speeches. All I have to