

bowed the knee to the Baal of race and creed prejudice, and who again and again defended the inalienable rights of religious minorities against unjust political antagonism. There are Protestant Liberals who fought the P. P. A. and its minions in their anti-Catholic campaign in Ontario ten years ago, who would not join the equal rights movement or withdrew from it when it was diverted to baser purposes, and who in every campaign of bigotry since confederation stood resolutely for the principle and the practice of religious tolerance and racial unity. To class those men, and men of their spirit, with the Toronto sensationalists, or to regard their opposition as either misguided or short-lived, is to comfort one's self in a fool's paradise.

Members of the Liberal party in the House of Commons would follow the counsels of prudence if, during the Easter recess, they sounded the most intelligent and most significant opinion of their leading support. The echo voice of the purblind partisan is unimportant, and members of parliament ought to guard against the soothing tones of those who would heal the hurt of the Liberal party lightly with their peace! peace! when there is no peace. A public man cannot afford to live in a fool's paradise.

I think, Sir, those words will sink deeper into the hearts and minds of hon. gentlemen opposite than the words that fell from the lips of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant). I notice in a cabled press despatch to-day the opinion of another authority, an eminent Canadian statesman who has been translated to the Senate, that place which in late years have become a haven of rest for defeated Liberal candidates and for political nonentities with long purses. I notice by a telegram to the Canadian Associated Press that Senator Fulford has been putting forth some views in England with regard to this question. I do not suppose that gentleman could possibly have received a copy of the 'Globe' in which appeared the editorial of the 19th of April, which I have just read, otherwise he would not have written the letter he did to the London 'Morning Chronicle.' I do not think that gentleman has ever been in very close touch with the masses of the people of this country, or with the electorate, and I think he would have done well to wait a little while until he became better acquainted with this question before he undertook to pose as a Canadian authority before the English people.

Now I do not propose to refer at any length to the manner in which this legislation was introduced into this House. It was introduced in a most peculiar manner. I cannot understand why the Prime Minister introduced it without having the advice and assistance of the ex-Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance. I believe if both those gentlemen had been present the educational clauses of this Bill would have been omitted, because the position they took in 1896 upon a similar issue was exactly opposite to the position they were obliged to take in support of the

Mr. KEMP.

present measure. But the Prime Minister may have felt that he was taking the course of least resistance, and that in forcing the Bill hurriedly into the House before these gentlemen returned he would have less resistance to overcome than he would have to meet from other quarters if he omitted these clauses from the Bill altogether. It seems to me in looking into that feature of the case that the Prime Minister was a little over confident in taking the action he did, that his recent successes at the polls had led him to go a little too far and to take up a position which he found himself unable to maintain.

Now, Sir, not having a legally trained mind, I am not able to say exactly what the ordinances of the Northwest legislature in respect to the school question mean, but it seems to me that they are liable to lead to a great many complications. We have the Finance Minister saying that by this process separate schools in the Northwest will gradually disappear; while on the other hand we have the opinion expressed outside this House that they mean the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge, and will have the effect of multiplying them. Now, Sir, with all these opinions before us, would it not be infinitely better at the present time to drop out these clauses altogether? I submit that if the Minister of Finance is correct in the view he takes that separate schools will disappear altogether in a short time, and if he is supporting this measure because he believes that will be the case. I cannot understand how his supporters, especially those from the province of Quebec whose views differ from those of other members in this House, can support that measure. Therefore, are we not drifting in another direction in this case the same as we drifted in 1896? Have I not proved to this House that the people of Ontario and the people of other parts of Canada generally believed in 1896 that the present Prime Minister was in principle opposed to separate schools in Manitoba, and are we not deceiving the people in the province of Quebec by this legislation? Is this legislation which the people of Quebec want? Will we not find this question cropping up again in the federal political arena in a very short time? I think that is bound to happen, and I believe that this legislation will be the beginning of strife and discord in this country.

Now before resuming my seat I desire briefly to refer to the peculiar position occupied by the ex-Minister of the Interior, the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). I think I cannot better characterize his attitude upon this question than by saying that he has been trying to make a wide turning movement. He resigned to prevent separate schools becoming a part of the constitution of the Northwest provinces. The Prime Minister said it was a question of words only between himself and the member for Brandon, indicating