

with the request to hand it on to Mr. Campbell, says :

Fully one-half of the signers of this petition are Liberals. It has been thought here that it would be wise to send the petition to our member, Mr. Archibald Campbell, M.P., and they hope it may awaken his ideas and affect his action.

What did they send that petition for ? For the purpose of declaring that they were opposed to separate schools as contained in the principle of that Bill. They had the school clauses before them through the press, they read the school clauses, they brought their judgment to bear upon them, and they sent this petition for the purpose of awakening their member, whom they thought was asleep with regard to this matter, and one half the signers are his own supporters. Are they misled ? If they are misled, is it not high time they should be enlightened ? For what was the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) voting ? Was he voting on the amendments that are to be proposed or was he voting on the Bill as it is before the House ? Certainly he was voting on the Bill as it is before the House, and the principle contained in that Bill with regard to education was the principle of separate schools up to the hilt. The Minister of Justice declares he intended it to be such, and it was such according to his interpretation of the law, and the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) voted for that principle. He then writes back to his supporters and declares there is no principle of separate schools in the Bill and that they are misled. Is it not time that they were enlightened and that this House was enlightened ? I say that by every principle and parliamentary rule that ought to guide any deliberative assembly in the world, it is as clear as anything can be that it is the bounden duty of the government to present to the House and to explain any proposed amendment to a Bill that changes any one principle of that Bill before the House is allowed to commit itself to a different principle which is contained in the Bill. That is the duty of parliament and of the government, and if they do less than that they are doing less than their duty. The government are doing less than their duty to-day ; they are willing to allow their own followers to go it blind ; they are willing to mislead their own followers and the country, and then they blame the press of the country, because they say they have written inflammatory articles, they have sent in strong petitions, they have talked about what they did not know. Why did they write these articles ? Why did they send in these petitions and the strong representations against the principle of the Bill ? Because they could only judge about what is before the country and the House, and it was on what is before the House that every hon. member voted, and in doing so he voted for separate

Mr. SPOULE.

schools right up to the hilt, according to the Minister of Justice. What will the following of the government say, who have declared one after another that they are opposed to the principle of separate schools, when they return to their people and are asked : Why did you vote on a Bill giving separate schools ? If these hon. gentlemen attempt to convince the electorate that they voted on something else that was not before the House, I am afraid that the electors will regard them as either very short sighted or as desiring only to mislead their own people and to do what is very much less than their duty in this House when they voted on the principle of that Bill, because they voted deliberately for the principle of separate schools. And the member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre), who declared he was against it, voted for separate schools. How will he explain himself to the clerical gentlemen who sent in their representations to him ? What will he tell them was before the House ? I am afraid they will take up the Bill and read it, and say : That is what is before the House. There was an amendment moved declaring against the principle. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) voted against that amendment. That was an amendment which declared against the principle of separate schools. Therefore, he voted for separate schools, as did every other hon. member following the government, as provided for in sections 2 and 16 of this Bill, and I am quite sure they can never convince the country that they did not vote for separate schools when they voted for the principle of the Bill as embodied in these two clauses.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I understood from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that he preferred not to deal with clause 16 just now. I had invited him to do so for the purpose of having a certain explanation. I assented at once with the understanding to which, I understood my hon. friend gave his approval, that after he made the explanation which I asked for we might, if necessary, have a little delay for the purpose of considering it. We were about proceeding to the consideration of section 20 when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who seems to be conspiring with my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to obstruct this legislation, saw fit to make one of those pop-gun speeches, if I may so describe them, which he occasionally discharges immediately before six o'clock. He referred to some notable events. He referred to the event of the election of the hon. member for Edmonton which was not contested.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear.' I have not heard that