

means he did to call to the attention of the government and the country the fact that he was being ignored, and that the militia force required and should have certain reforms which he indicated. What was the course taken by the right hon. the leader of the government? That man, a British subject and a soldier, was called upon the floor of this House by the right hon. gentleman a stranger and a foreigner and practically exiled from this country. Let me ask what was the conduct of the right hon. gentleman with regard to a certain other stranger and foreigner. We have in our midst now a gentleman against whom I have nothing whatever to say personally, but a gentleman who is not, to begin with, a British subject, who is not charged with the performance of any public duty so far as Canada is concerned, and that gentleman is not only allowed to interfere in the legislation of this country, but he is consulted as to what legislation shall take place. And that man is not called a foreigner and a stranger and is not sent away, but is taken into the bosom of the family, so to speak, and petted and pampered and excuses made for him. There was some excuse, whether Lord Dundonald was right or wrong, for the course he took, but where is the excuse that can be offered to any reasonable man for the treatment of Lord Dundonald in the way in which he was treated by this government and their treatment of Monseigneur Sbarretti. If the hon. gentleman was right in 1896 upon this school question, he must be wrong now. It is not possible for him to take the position he did then and now turn around and take the very opposite and say: I am right all the time. Let me ask you what was the attitude of the influence that was operating upon the hon. gentleman in 1896? Did the church of his faith, when he stood up in this House and defended the doctrine that Manitoba should not have separate schools, throw him out? Did it discard and did it discredit him? Did it say he was wrong then and he ought not to advocate such a course? No, not one word of condemnation, not one word of criticism. Why? I will come to that in a moment. We find him taking exactly the opposite course on this occasion and he could not have been right in both instances. But was that the case? No, just as in 1896, when they refused to condemn him for the course he took then, the church is standing by the right hon. gentleman although he is advocating an entirely different theory. There must be some reason for all that. The reason that appeals to my mind is this. That in 1896 there was some well defined plan, thoroughly understood between those two elements which was to have been worked out at some subsequent date, and I think the evidence before us in the Bills now engaging the attention of the House shows the working out of that proposition.

Mr. PORTER.

Now, Sir, when these Bills were introduced in this House there was a spontaneous expression of disappointment. That feeling of disappointment, after all the discussion that has taken place in this House, after all the discussion that has taken place through the public press has not downed at all, but has been growing and growing until it is a perfect chorus of condemnation of this measure from one end of this Dominion to the other. There is a general outcry against the injustice that will be done these new provinces by imposing upon them the system of separate schools provided for in these measures. There is an outcry at the injustice that will be done by binding and shackling the people in these new provinces by a system of education that is not agreeable to their wishes. These mutterings that we first heard in this House upon the introduction of these Bills have grown and will continue to grow, I verily believe, notwithstanding the passing of these measures by the force behind the right hon. Prime Minister. These mutterings will increase and grow, and there will be no possibility of there being perfect rest and a feeling of perfect freedom, unless this government shall see fit, in its wisdom, to withdraw the educational clauses of these Bills and allow these provinces to legislate on that subject as to them seems meet and just. And, now, Sir, this feeling of disappointment has been expressed by the press of this country, the greatest of all powers not only for the expression but for the formation of public opinion. The majority of the press have condemned these educational clauses. Resolutions have been passed by public meetings held in many places throughout the Dominion condemning this legislation. There have been pulpit discourses from almost every religious denomination in condemnation of these clauses. Educational bodies meeting in solemn conclave for the discussion of this matter, have also passed resolutions condemning this legislation. Educationalists, who are especially fitted to judge of this matter, have also announced themselves against this measure in unmistakable terms. And, Sir, hundreds, yes thousands, of the very best people in the Dominion of Canada have expressed the same sentiment by the petitions that have been presented from day to day to this House. And hon. members in this House have been endeavouring for days and weeks to convince this government that the legislation proposed under these Bills is not in the interest of the new provinces. Now, Sir, can it be possible that all these bodies, all these persons, all these petitioners, and the great majority of the public press—that all these are wrong upon this question? Is it possible that only the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the influences under which he is acting are right? Is the intelligence of the right hon. gentleman upon this question so heaven born, is his knowl-