

the west will be treated in the same way. It turns out now that this treatment is being meted out by the czar of the Liberal party without consulting his colleagues. And this man of autocratic tendencies gets up in this House and reads us a lecture and calls us all kinds of names; and yet, within less than forty-eight hours of his lecture to me, everything I said has been justified and proved true. The right hon. gentleman to-day stands discredited in this House. He stands discredited of his own colleagues; he stands discredited in the different provinces, especially in the province of Ontario, and by his own newspaper, the 'Globe.' The right hon. gentleman quoted George Brown. The right hon. gentleman actually read into the constitution the utterances of George Brown's newspaper and George Brown's speeches, in justification of this proposal of his to shackle these great new provinces of the west. The right hon. gentleman has failed. He has no justification for his proposal except as a matter of policy. But he has not made it a question of policy. He made a bogus constitutional argument, and then he made a moral argument, and that moral argument was what? Many a time in this House the right hon. gentleman has read us a lesson about respect for our neighbours; but there never was a more insulting statement made to the people of the United States than that statement of his that they were immoral, that divorces, lynchings and murders prevailed in their country, and that the reason of Canada's superiority in this respect was that dogma was taught in our public schools.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What the people of Canada believe in is the separation of state and church. With regard to what is embodied in the constitution, so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, we say all right, we accept the situation.

An hon. MEMBER. Thank you.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Nay, more; I go further and say, I for one would not lift my hand to prevent the people of these western provinces having separate schools if they desire them. But my plea is that the question must be left to them—that we must not impose these schools upon them. I am ready to declare here or anywhere else—shall I say as a radical or a democrat?—for the principle of the entire separation of church and state, so far as our constitution will permit it. The right hon. gentleman is in this House to-day as the champion of a new alliance between church and state. Again I warn him that he is on dangerous ground. Again I tell him that he who takes to the sword shall perish by the sword. He who apparently, a few weeks ago, entered on a long career of office, is to-day face to face with the handwriting on the wall. I would like to see the right hon.

gentleman introduce great measures into this House, and not bring up questions of this kind. I do not want to say anything against my hon. friend who has retired from office to-day; but if there is one thing he can recall, it is this: He came in on that wave; he goes out on that wave; whether it will carry him I leave him to find out in his own experience.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is still no question before the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has referred to matters which, perhaps should not have been referred to in discussing the question before the House. But, lest my silence should be misconstrued, I desire to make a short statement. I occupy, on this question, a much different position from that occupied, probably, by any other member in this House. My hon. friend from South York refers to the campaign of some ten years ago in the county of Haldimand. The fact was referred to that, on that occasion, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and myself stood on the same platform when we were fighting the men who are now calling in question the actions which have taken place and have caused that hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sifton's) retirement. Therefore, for the last ten years, my position on the school question has been defined. I also fought on the school question in 1895 in Cardwell, and again in June 1896 was the school question fought out in my riding. From that day to this, I have remained firm and free, so far as my constituency was concerned, upon this question, and I have been thrice endorsed upon it. Therefore, I simply rise to announce to this House as I announced the first time I spoke in the House and as I have previously announced to individual members, that I am, like the ex-Minister of the Interior, absolutely opposed to the education clauses as submitted in the Autonomy Bills; that I will oppose them and oppose them unalterably.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not rise to anticipate the discussion on the Bill that will shortly be before us or to explain to the House where I stand on the question—I think my position is pretty well known. But I rise merely to say that, so far as the Prime Minister has given this House his confidence, and so far as he has explained the position, all is well. But some of us thought he might well have gone a little further. Perhaps to expect that would be to ask him to anticipate events. He did not indicate in any way who is to be the incumbent of the office

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.