

Cyr,	Monk,
Delisle,	Morin,
Demers,	Mulock (Sir William),
Derbyshire,	Oliver,
Desjardins,	Parmelee,
Devlin,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Paquet,
Dugas,	Parent,
Dyment,	Perley,
Emmerson,	Piché,
Ethier,	Pickup,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Finlay,	Pringle,
Finlayson,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fitzpatrick,	Riley,
Forget,	Rivet,
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Gallery,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gallihier,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Gauvreau,	Rousseau,
Geoffrion,	Savoie,
Gervais,	Schell (Glengarry),
Girard,	Schell (Oxford),
Gordon,	Scott,
Grant,	Sifton,
Guthrie,	Sinclair,
Hall,	Sloan,
Harty,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Hughes	Stewart,
(King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot (Bellechasse),
Hunt,	Talbot (Strathcona),
Hyman,	Telford,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Thompson,
Johnston	Tobin,
(Cape Breton, South),	Turgeon,
Johnston (Lambton),	Turriff,
Kennedy,	Watson,
Lachance,	Wilson (Russell),
Lamont,	Worthington,
Lanctot,	Wright (Renfrew),
Lapointe,	Zimmerman—140.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.

Opposition.

Messrs.

German,

White.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, the speech made this afternoon by the Minister of Justice was in many respects a very able one. It was a speech worthy of his high position; was a speech worthy of his party; but in his prologue and in his peroration, he had evidently culled a number of gems from some of his St. Jean Baptiste Day addresses, and he delivered them with all the fervor of some of his St. Patrick's Day orations. That speech, in so far as it was argumentative, was a very able and very creditable speech to himself and to his party; but as I listened to it I came to the conclusion that it was delivered in the interest of a lost cause—that it was the last argument which was to be made in this country in favour of the ecclesiastical school that we know in the province of Ontario—of that school which the late Minister of the Interior condemned in former and recent times; that school which the new Prime Minister in the province of

Quebec has set out to reform, and which the late Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Mr. Tarte, has made special mention of in his newspaper by demanding reform in public instruction in the province of Quebec. And that speech was marked by something else: it was characterized by the fact that the Minister of Justice demolished the whole argument of his leader. The argument of his leader was that the constitution was imperative, that it was categorical, that it devolved on parliament the duty of introducing separate school clauses into this Bill. If I gather anything from the argument of the Minister of Justice, it was that there was nothing categorical or imperative in the constitution in that respect. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) challenged the government to show where the constitution has made it imperative that such a clause should be introduced into this Bill. And he referred to something on which we are entitled to an explanation this evening: he referred to the changes that had been made in section 16 of the Bill. That amended clause was made a part of this measure on the proposal for its second reading. What was more to the point, it was on the original section 16 that the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) withdrew his support from the government, and we are told that he was followed by all the members from the west. Some explanation was made to the late minister and to the members from the west as a reason for the change that was made in that clause; why was that reason not given to the House to-night? Why was it held back at a time when we were entitled to it? The Minister of Justice this afternoon argued that the question was one of expediency, that we were free to do as we liked, but that we were in honour bound to carry out our engagements to the minority. That may be; but we were in honour bound to do something more; we were in honour bound to do justice to all the people of the west rather than to the minority. That point also was made very clear in the speech made this evening by the hon. member from St. John, N.B.

The Minister of Justice rested his whole case on this argument, and on it I intend to take my stand and make an appeal to my supporters in my own constituency and in my own province from one end of it to the other: he said that as he read the constitution there was no province that was not restricted in the matter of education. That in a measure is true, but if the provinces restricted, if a condition was imposed on Ontario and the other original contracting provinces, it was imposed upon them by themselves. In this case, however, the restriction is imposed on the people of the west, not by themselves, but by an almost solid Quebec. These people in the west are just as much entitled to be considered in the matter of schools as were