

and outsiders on this question. How he got all this information I leave him to explain. It is indeed difficult for us to understand how he secured it, if it be true. Of course it is well to put in that proviso. No doubt in 1894 he was just as prophetic about what was then going to happen at the next election as he was the other day; and I suppose his prophecies concerning the result of the next election will be just about as true as they were concerning the last.

My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), I do not want to say very much about. But, really, as an older man, I cannot refrain from giving him a little advice. I cannot refrain from telling him that I think, and a great many other members think the same, that a young member, just come to the House, should not speak in quite so flippant a manner about men on the other side whom our late Queen thought worthy of honour. Now, he made some, as I thought, very insulting remarks about the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and about the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock). I would be very sorry to hear any one on the government side make any such remarks about the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and I have never heard anything of that kind yet. I would advise the young gentleman, a budding politician, that if he ever expects to occupy such a position as these gentlemen occupy, he will have to learn to be a little more courteous in his demeanour to those to whom he is opposed.

Just one other matter and I am done. My hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Elson) spoke of the danger which would arise through Mormons being able, under this Bill, to use the schools for the advocacy of their tenets amongst the children. He drew us a very startling picture of a family who happened to be in a Mormon settlement and whose children would be obliged to attend the school controlled by the Mormons. And he read the clause from the Act, which I will read you again, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Elson) did not read far enough. Here it is:

(1) No religious instruction, except as hereinafter provided, shall be permitted in the school of any district on the opening of any such school until one-half hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction permitted or desired by the board may be given.

(2) It shall, however, be permissible for the board of any district to direct that the school be opened by the recitation of the Lord's prayer.

Now, the hon. gentleman went that far and then stopped, leaving his hearers who were not familiar with this provision of the law, I am sure, under a wholly wrong impression. I can hardly believe that this was intentional, because I liked the tenor of his remarks, and I do not think he is a man who would intentionally mislead. But

the omission of the next clause certainly would leave a wrong impression upon the minds of those not familiar with the law. The next clause says:

Any child shall have the privilege of leaving the school room at the time at which religious instruction is commenced, as provided for in the next preceding section, or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction that need be given, if the parents or guardians so desire.

I think that alters the case. The parent, by simply telling his child to leave school at half-past three, can prevent the child receiving any religious instruction of which he does not approve.

There has been so much said on this question that I am not going to take up the time of the House longer. I close by asking all my friends in the House, and all Protestants everywhere, in this case as in all cases, to be charitable, generous and just.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make for entering upon this debate, though it has continued now for upwards of a month, for a large majority in the constituency I have the honour to represent, irrespective of politics, will expect not only that I should vote, but that also that I should give utterance to the views that they hold, which, I am glad to say are the views I hold myself. No question in Canadian politics for many years has attracted so much attention as this. In 1896 the attention of the Dominion was directed to what was known as the Remedial Bill, relating to the province of Manitoba. But that public attention was as nothing compared to the attention that has been aroused in the present instance. This is due primarily to the fact that the people of the Dominion regarded the boundaries of the province of Manitoba as settled and that province as pretty well populated, so that, even if there were a principle embodied in the school laws by which a system of separate schools was foisted upon the people of Manitoba only a comparatively small number of people would be affected. But the development of the Northwest, which has gone on so rapidly, and which we hope to see increase even more rapidly, means that there will be there no limited population, but a population of millions upon millions. In view of the number of people to be affected, the whole population of the Dominion are interested in the question whether there is to be riveted upon that country for all time a system of separate schools.

Now, this question has been dealt with by this government in a most peculiar fashion. Up almost to the very day of the general elections last fall, not a single word was heard as to proposed legislation of the Dominion parliament for the establishment of provincial government in these Territor-