

responsible for the opinions of the Toronto 'Telegram.' Reference was made to the Bill of 1902 as submitted by Mr. Haultain. The Minister of Justice did not pay much of a compliment to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when he said that the draft Bill was submitted to the government for its consideration. If that statement meant anything at all it meant that the draft Bill contained the very sections the ex-Minister of the Interior is objecting to in the Bill introduced by the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have read that draft Bill and I fail to find in it any similarity to the educational clauses in the Bill now introduced. That being true, the government could not have consulted the ex-Minister of the Interior with respect to these educational clauses.

I wish to say a word or two about these gentlemen who resign from the government. It seems to me that if a question arises on which the difference of opinion between one of the ministers and his colleagues is so clear that he feels it is his duty to resign, then, he is not doing his duty to his conscience, or to the people he represents, or to the people who agree with him, by sitting silently in his place and refraining from taking any part in the discussion of that question when it comes up. It strikes me that if I were in such a connection, I would lose no opportunity to make myself heard. I would rise day after day and, by my protests seek to prevent the passing of the legislation which seemed to me so far wrong. Those hon. gentlemen who have resigned from the cabinet seem to think they do their duty when they make one speech explaining their position. If there are more ministers in the cabinet who take the same view, it seems to me that, even though they differ with their colleagues they might as well swallow the objectionable legislation whole and remain where they are.

Now, a word about the petitions and I am through. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) seems to lay great stress upon the fact that certain Conservatives sign petitions in favour of this legislation. I fail to see why any Conservative in the province of Quebec, or Nova Scotia, or in the Northwest Territories for that matter, if he feels that the legislation introduced by the government of the day is legislation that should be approved, does any wrong by petitioning the government in favour of its being made law. If the petition is a proper one, one that can be fairly presented to this House, in what way does a Conservative violate good taste or any rule of this House when he signs it? But, what is the object of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has stated? He remembers quite well the conduct of his own friends in 1896—his own included—when they did not take an honourable stand on the school question. They fanned the flame of prejudice, and it

was only by doing so that they attained power. A prominent legal Liberal came to this House in 1896 and advised his friends here to keep up the work of increasing popular prejudice as the only means by which they could get into power. And, had it not been for their success in that work, they would have been in opposition until this day. And I say, as a humble member of this Conservative opposition, that, I would remain in opposition until doomsday rather than obtain power by such means. We ought to be above that kind of thing, and we are. We have here a good country, a great country, and our aim, instead of stirring contention should be to unite our people and, as far as possible to quench these dangerous fires of popular prejudice.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish merely to refer to one or two statements made in the course of this discussion. The first was a statement by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who spoke of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) as occupying a dual position, and in one capacity stirring up strife in the country, while in the other he might be doing his duty as a member of this House. That can only refer to one thing, to the petitions which are coming in and which hon. gentlemen opposite have been good enough to attribute to myself as having sent them out. I accept that; and I gave the explanation. I have never denied or attempted to deny that I did it nor do I make any apology for doing it. The Minister of Justice followed this up by saying that the members of the opposition were deliberately and of set purpose arousing religious prejudices by distributing petitions amongst the Protestants of Ontario for that purpose while, from the same source, they were distributing petitions to the people of Quebec to arouse feeling amongst them. I took down the hon. gentleman's statement as he made it. Have I recorded it correctly?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says he took it down, I suppose he took it down correctly. But I must say that I do not think he did.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the statement as I took it down. Had it not been that the Minister of Justice displayed so much warmth and declared that he could prove his statement, while at the same time flourishing a document as though it contained the proof, I would not have paid so much attention to his statement. But he made the statement that these petitions emanated from the same source as the others. And just before that he had attributed the distribution of these petitions in Ontario to myself. Had he not thus, by implication at least, attributed the distribution of these petitions to myself, I would not have paid any attention to the matter. If any one in this House could know whether his allega-