

tent than under the school system of the Northwest Territories. These schools were secured through the good will of the majority and when the hon. gentleman was asked a pertinent question by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) why we should not expect the same result in the new provinces of the west he states: Possibly so, but when 41 per cent of the population have a suspicion that they may not get that fairness it is only right we should respond to their demands. In other words 59 per cent of the population have to be governed by the wishes of the other 41 per cent.

The ex-Minister of the Interior is not in accord with the Prime Minister on his constitutional argument. He states that he largely agrees with the views of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) but still he is going to support the Bill. In fact he has stated that the whole question should be left to the provinces. On page 3256 of 'Hansard' he is reported as follows:

But for my part I have no hesitation in saying what my own opinion would be. It would be that the province ought to be left entirely free to deal with its own educational affairs.

This was the opinion expressed by that hon. gentleman, but still he is not going to carry it into effect by voting against this Bill. He went further:

I am convinced it would be better for the Roman Catholic people of the Northwest Territories if the legislature were left absolutely free.

And again:

I do not think they would be able to convince me that it would not be better that the legislature of the Northwest Territories should be free.

If the hon. gentleman desires to be consistent and vote according to the convictions he thus expressed, would he not oppose this clause which is not going to leave the people of the Territories free to deal with this matter? Why should he set up one policy to be carried into effect in his own province and a diametrically opposite one to be carried out in the new provinces? If he had changed his opinion, if he had been converted, as the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has been with regard to the land clause, if he had conscientiously recanted his old time convictions, he might have an excuse, but he has not. What therefore is the reason he gives boldly and unblushingly in the presence of this free parliament why he is going to support the Bill. Did he take any high moral ground? Well, this House can judge for itself. This is the ground he took:

I came to the conclusion that whatever anybody else might do, my course is perfectly clear. I should, when this question came up, be in a position to speak with the freedom with which a member of the government could not speak, and I should be called on to decide to what

extent and how far I would be prepared to compromise opinions which I had publicly expressed, and opinions which I still hold, in order not to destroy—

What?

—in order not to destroy the government of which I have been a member.

Here we have the secret—party exigencies. It is on that high moral plane that the hon. gentleman is going to support this Bill. He went on:

That question which comes to every man in public life sooner or later comes to-day to a good many men in this House of Commons. The question is how far a man is justified in compromising his opinion for the purpose of preventing a political crisis.

How very solicitous the hon. gentleman was about precipitating on this country a political crisis! He followed in the wake of his colleague, the Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman was aghast at the idea of the leader of the opposition being called upon to form a government, because that government would have to be, according to him, a Protestant government, and then the country would go to the bow-wows entirely. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an insult to our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. It is an insult to them to imagine that the leader of the opposition could not get any one of that faith to come in and form a government with him simply because he desired to leave to the new provinces the entire control of their educational system.

The hon. member for Edmonton told us that all the petitions which have been coming here for the past month, the meetings that have been held, the resolutions that have been passed, were simply for the purpose of creating political party capital. I would ask him if the Toronto 'Globe' is so solicitous for the welfare of the Conservative party that it is opposing this Bill. I will give that newspaper the credit no matter how much it has tried to trim since, it did at one time take the proper ground and stand for the old landmark of provincial rights which Liberals advocated in the years gone by. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that the Toronto 'Globe' is animated solely with the desire of putting a Conservative government into office. The whole independent press, almost without exception, are condemning the government on account of this Bill. And what about all these strong old time Liberals which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) called renegade Liberals because they happened not to see eye to eye with the leader of the government and his colleagues in this matter. Is Mr. T. C. Robbette, of Toronto, who was a candidate in Toronto Centre at the last general election, and who would be candidate at the next election in that riding, were the government not afraid to test public opinion there,—is Mr.