

are laughing times, peaceful times, times of plenty and prosperity and due largely to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government to-day. We do not object to our Conservative friends rejoicing with us in the prosperity of the country. We wish to do them well, and, Sir, we believe that by keeping the Prime Minister in power under his happy influences, supported by the men who are around him, who have full confidence in him, there are in store years of progress and prosperity greater even than we have attained in the past, and, Sir, in this young country we must above all things be a united people, be Canadians one and all with equal rights and privileges.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I thought that this House had for the last two or three weeks and especially for the last two or three days been discussing a most serious question, a question that is recognized in this country, that is recognized by every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, except the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), as the most serious question we have had before this House in many and many a session of parliament. I suppose the strain of it has been too great, and therefore it has been arranged that we should have, for our relief, an exhibition of nigger minstrelsy and that a member of the government should be set up to do the Bardell and Pickwick sergeant Buzfuz act. He has done it admirably. He has done it to the entertainment of the hon. gentlemen who sit in front of him and behind him, but he has not done it to the edification of the country, nor has he answered the charges that are made against the government.

The question before the House to-day is not the prosperity of the country; the question before the House to-day is not concerning old matters and old controversies between old members on this side and old members on that side of the House. The question before the country to-day is: shall we be governed by our own people or shall we be governed by a delegate representing a foreign authority?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBER. Shame.

Mr. OSLER. Now, let us look at it squarely and fairly in the face—

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, look at it fairly.

Mr. OSLER. Let us look at it fairly and let us face it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Face it honestly.

Mr. OSLER. Yes, honestly. When this Bill was first brought into this House, it was admitted that the man who ought to have been consulted, the Premier of the

Northwest Territories, had not been consulted—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. Was not consulted on this clause.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. It has been admitted that the other member of the Northwest Territories cabinet of the same faith as the Prime Minister—

Mr. BELCOURT. What has that got to do with it?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is a great crime to be of that faith.

Mr. OSLER. I do not make that charge against any one at all—

Mr. BELCOURT. Oh, no.

Mr. OSLER. I am only showing the unfortunate position that the Prime Minister has put himself and the country in—

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask my hon. friend to whom he refers—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day—

Mr. SCOTT. May I put a question to my hon. friend? To whom in the Haultain cabinet does he refer, as being of the same faith as the Prime Minister?

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. OSLER. It has been charged here to-day, and it has not been denied, that the Prime Minister, although he did not consult the premier of the Territories, was in constant consultation with the Papal legate in the framing of these educational clauses. I will give the Prime Minister an opportunity to deny that now, and if he denies it I shall withdraw all I am going to say; I will not proceed farther.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. OSLER. That is the charge that is made. When the storm arose after this Bill was brought in, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, the next time they spoke, both said that the intention of that clause was simply to let things in the Northwest remain as they are to-day. Is that true? If that be true, it took a whole month after the first Bill was introduced to get somebody to agree to the modification as we have it now. If the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and all the other members of the cabinet understood, or rather meant, that one thing should be embodied in that clause but found that another thing quite different was really in the clause