

settle the question as to whether or not the new provinces shall have the same control of education as is enjoyed by the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, and since the defeat of the Remedial Bill, by the then apostles of provincial rights, the province of Manitoba.

When the debate began, the rock of the constitution stood out in bold relief with a danger signal on its summit, but the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was the first to see that danger signal and strike for terra firma, and the waves of discord and dissention were loosed in deference to the man on the street. The rock has been submerged and nought remains save the danger signal; and a government with convictions which change with dates, are as strongly opposed to provincial rights to-day as they were ardent in favour of them in 1896. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) quoted the speech of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) which was delivered at Caledonia Springs in April, 1895. In that speech the ex-Minister of the Interior was very warm in his denunciation of separate schools, but as this speech has been fully quoted by my hon. friend from Marquette, I will content myself with citing only one item which deals more especially with provincial rights. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) there said:

I will venture the statement that the true interests of the Roman Catholics of Manitoba will be better advanced by a policy of conciliation than by a policy of coercion. This Remedial Bill which the government are trying to force upon an unwilling parliament, even if it should pass, cannot settle the question. It would be an attack upon provincial rights. If the Roman Catholics are ever to obtain a solution of this question which is worth having they must obtain it from the good will of the majority of the people of the province to which they belong.

What has since come over the spirit of the hon. gentleman's dream? What magic spell, what hypnotic influence has sent this doughty champion of provincial rights back into the rank and file of the great Liberal party to-day—that party which has bartered its principles for power? Some men die hard; others are dead easy, and in the latter category the right hon. the First Minister seems to have found the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway).

Though this Bill is a working model of a plan submitted to the House for inspection, before the plant is laid down on a larger scale, and though some alterations have been made in the machinery to enable it to run more easily and smoothly—perhaps with less vibration and danger to its boilers for the adoption of turbines—it practically remains the same working model, and as such has taken up the attention of the House for many weeks. Consequently at

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

this late hour of the debate, I do not intend to devote any extended remarks to its perfections or imperfections.

As a junior member of the House, I shall not presume for a moment to discuss the question of the constitution, and for excellent reasons, the most important of which is, not that it does not appeal to the man on the street, but because the constitution seems, in the latter stages of the debate, to have been lost sight of. What I will have to say in defence of the action I may take will be drawn from the records of British fair play and from the traditions of the Conservative party; from that sense of equity and justice which prevails wherever the flag of the motherland floats to-day—that sense of justice which gave equal rights to French and English Catholics and Protestants in Quebec, and which, after an arduous struggle of three years in South Africa, entailing the loss of thousands of her sons and the expenditure of many millions, has given to a valiant foe equal rights of language, religion and education; from the traditions of a party that has always been true to the principles of equality and justice to the minority, Protestants or Catholics. Personally I would be in favour of national schools, but representing a constituency composed of all classes, creeds and nationalities which go to make up our great Canadian nationality, I consider that I am not here to advance my personal ideas at the expense of my constituents, that I am not here to express the opinions of Catholics or the opinions of Protestants, but to endeavour to arrive at a conclusion which will be satisfactory to all, and to make my views subservient to those of the great majority of the people I have the honour to represent.

I do not intend to make more than a passing reference to the school ordinances of 1891. I would like to include them in my remarks, but they have been fully explained by hon. members on both sides of the House. In these ordinances there is nothing that can give offence to anybody. Under these, the regulating of the duties of teachers and the control of the schools is given to the commissioners appointed by the Territorial government and will be within the jurisdiction of the new provinces under the Bills creating them, subject to the religious instruction provided for under clause 137, and this should commend itself to all loyal and God-fearing people. As I have said, this part of the question has been referred to frequently and at length, and I shall not continue the discussion. In the first public school I attended in my native town there were two teachers—a Protestant and a Catholic. One or the other opened the daily exercises with the Lord's prayer. And this was acceptable to every one. Since then some of my warmest friends professional, socially and politic-