

one word been said against separate schools; yet the hon. gentleman tries to make the people believe that all the noise about separate schools, that all the questions about race and creed, have emanated from this side of the House. I challenge him or any other hon. gentleman to produce one syllable, one line or one word that has been uttered from this side, pointing in the direction he has indicated. The hon. gentleman also referred to the utterances of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Let him read the speech of my hon. friend from East Grey, and I defy him to find one word in it against separate schools, or one word calculated to raise race or religious feelings in this country. He read from a document which he said was sent out by direction of the hon. member for East Grey, and insinuated that it was the production of the hon. member for East Grey. I thought the hon. gentleman would not lower himself to anything of the kind. He read from a circular which he said emanated from my hon. friend from East Grey. But my hon. friend from East Grey did not produce any such document, on the contrary, he did not approve of the document that the member for Shefford read from.

It was a resolution passed by some lodge. My hon. friend from East Grey had nothing to do with it, and yet the hon. member for Shefford gets up and attributes it to my hon. friend. He said that some little bird had whispered into the ear of my hon. friend from East Grey that a Bill of this kind was to be introduced. Did not the hon. gentleman hear the speech from the Throne when the Governor General announced that these Autonomy Bills would be introduced this session? Is the Governor General of this country to be referred to by the hon. gentleman as a little bird whispering in the ears of members of this House? He referred to the fact that ministers had stated in the campaign that autonomy would be given. Had it depended on the statement of ministers, no person, not even my hon. friend from East Grey, would have paid any attention to it, but when the Governor General came down and announced that these Autonomy Bills would be introduced, my hon. friend from East Grey then had every right to say to his friends in the country that they were going to be introduced. The hon. member for Shefford, like every one who has preceded him in this debate, closed his remarks with a eulogy of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—the greatest man that ever lived on earth. He would be worth millions to Barnum if he had him. That is all in line with the course pursued by other members of the party. They eulogize the minister and they take the patronage. The hon. member for Shefford did not deal very much with the Bill before the House; therefore, I do not propose following him any further. Representing, as I do, one of the strongest Pro-

testant constituencies in the province of Ontario, one containing, I think, more Orangemen than any other constituency in Canada, and at the same time containing a population of about 3,500 or 3,600 French and Irish Roman Catholics and having about 800 Roman Catholic voters in my constituency, I think it my duty to the people whom I represent that I should say a few words on the question before the House and explain the position that I purpose taking. I have received many letters from constituents of mine throughout the county. I will not trouble the House with more than one, which is a fair sample, to which I replied immediately, giving the position I purpose taking on this question. This letter is as follows:—

Elgin, Ontario, March 15th, 1905.

Mr. George Taylor, M.P.,

Dear Sir,—Pressure of work has prevented me from writing to you earlier, but ever since the Prime Minister introduced the now famous Autonomy Bill I have felt that this is a fine opportunity for the forces in opposition and the Protestant forces in the House to serve Canada and the future. I do not believe any government in Canada for many years has made a proposal so unreasonable, or so opposed to the genuine unity of our country as this ultra-montaine educational policy for the two new provinces. From no point of view can I see that it is defensible as it stands. Its unconstitutionality, its impolitic invasion of territorial or provincial privilege, its coercive projection into the unknown future of the progressive west of a mediaeval system of schools, and its almost certain results in the way of dissension amongst the various elements of a much mixed population—all condemn this scheme as altogether bad. I sincerely hope you will advocate the elimination of the educational clauses.

Sincerely yours,  
(Sgd.) GEO. L. CLENDINNEN.

I sent the following reply:—

Ottawa, March 17, 1905.

Rev. George L. Clendinnen,  
Elgin, Ontario.

Reverend and Dear Sir,—I am much pleased to receive your letter of the 15th instant, referring to the Bills now before parliament in reference to the new provinces for the Northwest. In reply I beg to say I fully agree with all you say, and am very much pleased that the Protestant clergy of all denominations are taking so much interest in the matter. I am very much pleased also with the attitude of the 'Christian Guardian.'

The position to-day is quite different from the Manitoba question. Then it was the minority appealing under the provisions of the constitution for their rights. When Manitoba was given a constitution these rights of separate schools were provided, but the Greenway government abolished them. The decision of the Privy Council was that the legislature had exclusive jurisdiction in dealing with educational matters, but the minority had a grievance, and under the constitution had a right to appeal to the Dominion parliament for remedial legislation. But it is very singular that the parties headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier were the parties who claimed provincial rights for Mani-