

the afternoon, when practically the school day is over, a half-hour of religious training will be allowed; and he asked the member for Labelle if he was content with such a meagre provision as that. What was the object of that? It was too transparent—perhaps the hon. gentleman thought no one could see it. The object of that was to tell the people of Quebec: Sir Wilfrid Laurier is giving you, not bread, but a stone; he is not giving you any measure that will meet the views and feelings and perhaps the prejudices of the people of Quebec; he is deceiving you, and I want to convince the member for Labelle of that fact, and I trust to his being a missionary to disseminate that doctrine in Quebec, and to stir up the good people of the province to demand more from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and perhaps to embarrass his policy.

When the hon. member for North Toronto comes to deal with the Territories, what does he say? In loud language and in violent terms he says, why bind these young giants in this way? And he goes on to say: If you give this measure to the Territories, Nova Scotia is entitled to the same, British Columbia is entitled to it, all the other provinces that do not enjoy it are entitled to it. He appeals to the Territories practically to rise in revolt against this measure if it becomes law, and, if possible to make it a great political question; and at the same time he appeals to the minorities in the other provinces, saying to them: The minority in the new provinces have got something—you demand it too. He thus appeals to one class and another—to the French Catholics of Quebec, to the Irish Catholics in another province, to the Protestants in another, trusting that by raising these fires in each of these provinces, he may at last involve this whole Dominion in one huge, far-reaching religious conflagration. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the hon. gentleman is here to voice the sentiments of his constituents. But, Sir, I regard them as taking a higher view of the duties of their representative than to demand of him that he shall play the role of the political incendiary on the floor of this House.

The hon. gentleman assailed the ex-Minister of the Interior. Whenever, for a moment, any other line of thought failed him, he turned to the ex-minister, who seemed to be the special object of his poisoned shafts. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity of judging of the services rendered to this country by the ex-Minister of the Interior for the last eight years. He assumed the most important portfolio having regard to the needs of this country, that we have. Other men before him had held it, and had failed. For years our great prairies had remained almost a solitude. The late government had an opportunity for eighteen years to make an impression there, and failed; and when the member for

Brandon (Mr. Sifton) assumed that portfolio, and the Manitoba school question disappeared from the vexed question of the day, a complete change came over the conditions of this country. I venture to say, what I have said before—and I say it without seeking to discredit any person—that of all the ministers who have held portfolios since confederation, none has rendered as valuable services to Canada as the ex-Minister of the Interior, and his withdrawal from our cabinet is a national loss. The hon. member for North Toronto asked me if I was a member of the sub-committee that had had to do with considering the terms of the constitution of these Territories. I was. He asked me if I had discovered the meaning of section 16, containing the educational clauses, which he has described as worded in such a subtle way as really to conceal their true object. Had it not been, he said, for the disclosure made by the member for Brandon of the meaning of those clauses, they would have passed into law, and then this country would have been for ever under the obligation of maintaining an enormous endowment for the Catholic church. I do not admit, nor does the government, the correctness of the construction placed upon the original clause 16 by the ex-Minister of the Interior. Lawyers may differ, and according to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) 213 members of this House would have been deceived but for the ex-Minister of the Interior. Does the hon. gentleman think that I am more astute to discover the weak points of the clause than the other 212 men?

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact, I did not say that. I said that the clause was so worded that had it not been for the disclosure given of its meaning by the ex-Minister of the Interior, it doubtless would have passed through this House and its true meaning would have been undetected. That is what I said.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. Well, I do not pretend to be more astute than, or even as astute as a very large number of the members of this House, but when the hon. gentleman admits himself that he would not have discovered the hidden meaning in this clause and that all those around him would not have discovered it, surely he will be charitable to another weak member of humanity who was likewise not able to discover it.

Mr. FOSTER. He was on duty.

Sir WILLIAM MULLOCK. I only plead that if the other 212 members of this House were as blind as myself, I am in very excellent company. May I not ask, after this question has been debated for three hours to-day, the House to come back to the real issue?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.