

port shown by certain newspapers towards the administration. I am sure he could render good service to his party if he would go down to the city of Montreal and get the Montreal 'Gazette' and the 'Montreal Star' to mend their ways and back up the policy of the opposition. Perhaps, however, the attitude of the newspapers is not so very important; and if my hon. friend desires to promote party unity, surely he will find in his own party ample room for missionary work.

The hon. gentleman referred to the recent election of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). A short time ago our friends to your left, Mr. Speaker, were challenging the government to open a constituency in the Northwest. The leader of the opposition—or rather I should say the hon. gentleman who usually leads it, but who does not in this matter—expressed upon the floor of this House his approval of the selection of the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of the Interior. He publicly stated that he would make a good Minister of the Interior, and while my hon. friend has just spoken (Mr. Bennett) attributes the election of that minister to the fact that the electors of the district of Edmonton are largely composed of Galicians and Russians and other foreigners who came into this country from the continent, we have it upon the authority of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the Galicians and the Doukhobors were all opposed to separate schools. Speaking in this House on the 23rd March, he said:

I have letters stating that if petitions had been sent to the Doukhobors, translated into their language, seventy-five per cent of them would sign those petitions. So would the Galicians and so would the Roman Catholics of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not justified in saying that I said all of them were opposed to separate schools.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I was not aware that I said all, and if I did so I was certainly mistaken, but the hon. member said seventy-five per cent of them would sign those petitions and that so would the Roman Catholics. He went on to say:

The Galicians say we left one country because of the tyranny of the church and we were told that we were coming to a free country, and we do not want it in Canada.

Surely that constituency is just the sort of one that our hon. friends desired. Surely it is one after my hon. friend's heart. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition made the statement that the present Minister of the Interior would make a very capable minister, that he was a personal friend of his and would like to see the First Minister select him. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the people generally of the constituency of Edmonton were opposed to the idea of separate schools.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not mention that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I submit that if the hon. gentleman's words have any meaning, the interpretation I have placed upon them is a fair one. Now the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) also complains that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has not made his address, I presume, upon the legal aspect of the measure. The argument of the Minister of Justice is in the Bill; where everybody can read it. But the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has given no legal opinion on this measure—absolutely none. And I submit that there are very few hon. members on the opposition side who have given such an opinion. The leader of the opposition has stated that he stands by the constitution, but he has not endeavoured to explain what the constitution is, he has not uttered a single word which would make clear what the effect of this Bill would be legally or what would be the effect if the constitution were applied. So, upon that score, I think my hon. friend has not very much reason to complain concerning the delay of the speech of the Minister of Justice.

The attitude assumed by the opposition on this question is a strange one. I believe it is not a fair one. For instance, the hon. member for East Simcoe stated that he would support the amendment of the leader of the opposition on several grounds. There is only one ground upon which a member of this House can intelligently support that amendment, and that is upon the constitutional ground. The leader of the opposition stated that the educational clauses constitutionally were ultra vires. Therefore he moved the amendment. He deliberately stated in this House, and stated more than once, that it was not a question of separate schools or national schools. But the hon. member for East Simcoe declared a moment ago that he was going to support the amendment because he was opposed to separate schools. The same remarks might be made regarding the speeches of all those hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on the measure. And what has been the result? I submit that the result has been the creation of an agitation in the country that is most undesirable. I say that this agitation is largely due to the fact that the Conservative party as represented in this House to-day has no policy and the members have been permitted to go here, there and everywhere. One hon. member was allowed to make one statement, and another hon. member a different statement. There were just two ways to deal with this issue. It could possibly be argued fairly on constitutional grounds, or it could be dealt with as a matter of public policy. And the opposition, I contend should have taken one or other of these grounds. But they agreed to go every man for himself, upon the