

how could their children be educated? Could we expect the children of the minority to go to schools regulated by the regulations which I have just read? No one would expect that, no government in Quebec would legislate in any such way, and neither would this parliament in any shape or form attempt to interfere with the privileges of the minority in Quebec. Why, Sir, it would be just as unreasonable to interfere with the privileges of the minority in Quebec, to take away those privileges and force the children of the minority into the Catholic schools as it would be for the province of Ontario to attempt to enact a law forcing Catholic children to go to Presbyterian Sunday schools. One would be just as ridiculous as the other.

We have heard a good deal of boasting in the speeches of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the hon. Minister of Finance in reference to the great majority that is going to be rolled up when this Bill comes to the vote. I had no doubt at all when I heard the hon. Minister of Finance announce the great majority that would be rolled up, and when I heard him tell how the party were united that there would be a great majority. I look forward to a great majority. The government have made this a party issue. They have required all their supporters to come to their assistance.

An hon. MEMBER. We got some of yours.

Mr. KEMP. But, the majority which they will roll up on this question will not be the majority which was elected to vote on this question or to deal with it in any shape or form. The government have a large majority and they will gain a few from this side of the House who may see eye to eye with them on this question, but the government were not elected on this issue, this issue was not before the country in the recent elections; in fact no hint was given to the electors that such a grave issue should be raised in the event of this administration being returned to power, and it cannot be said that these hon. gentlemen who are voting represent in every case the views of their constituents. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his remarks, seemed to indicate that there was no honesty of purpose in the agitation which exists in regard to this question. He seemed to think there was no honesty of purpose in the west in the agitation which is going on. He was not generous enough to credit any one who differed from him on this subject with sincerity. He did not seem to be of the opinion that any one else had a right to express a different opinion from him. It seemed to me that the hon. Minister of Agriculture did to some extent play the role of the tyrant in the attitude which he displayed when he discussed this question, but I beg to assure the hon. Min-

Mr. KEMP.

ister of Agriculture and other hon. members of this House that the end is not yet, and that they will have cause to feel that they have made a mistake in the course which they have taken.

I have already referred to the attitude which the hon. Minister of Finance took when he discussed this question and when it seemed to me he made the most illogical speech that I had ever heard him make. It seemed to me that when an hon. gentleman like himself would take an exactly different position from that which he took in 1896 he was most illogical in the conclusions which he came to and in the statements which he made. Mr. Speaker, it is only nine years since we had an agitation similar to the present one in this country, since we had a question similar to this question which is now before us. It is still fresh in the minds of every hon. member of this House, and it did seem to me that if there was any reasonable excuse that the government could have found for dealing with this question in any other way, for instance, by leaving it to the provinces instead of dealing with it themselves, or if they could have adopted any other possible means, they should have done so, and I must confess that I was dumbfounded with the lack of seriousness with which the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) tossed this vexed question into the arena of federal politics having in view what happened only nine years ago. The right hon. gentleman was fresh from the country. He had come back from the country with a large majority and it did seem to me, that, notwithstanding the fact that a large section of the people of this country were agitated in 1896 over practically the same issue, he must have thought he was invincible and that he could lead the people and bring them to his views on this or any other question. Did the right hon. gentleman think that the agitation which took place on this same question in 1896 was simply a joke, and did he welcome another agitation of the same kind? Did he think it was a good thing for us to wrangle in this House for weeks and months on a question of this kind? Were there no important issues which would have for their object to promote the prosperity and happiness of the people of this country? I say I regret the manner in which this question was introduced, and I can see no reasonable excuse for it being so introduced.

A good deal has been said about the agitation which is at present going on in various parts of the country, and especially in the province from which I come. A good deal of surprise has been expressed that there should be any agitation, and some members of this House have gone so far as to say that there is no particular feeling or sentiment on the question in Ontario be-