

that out of the ten members from the Northwest seven were supporting the Bill, and for that reason he held that there should be no complaint against it. But, if the members from the Northwest stood five for and five against, then the argument of the Minister of Finance would go for nothing. I would ask those gentlemen who applauded the Minister of Finance to remember, that when the Manitoba Remedial Bill was before the House every member from Manitoba with the exception of Mr. Joseph Martin was in favour of that Bill, and using the argument of the Minister of Finance then the Remedial Bill should have been adopted by parliament. The Minister of Finance threatened his followers into supporting this Bill, and for fear that they still might be fleeing away from the government my genial friend from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) came to the rescue and he offered a wager that the Bill would be supported by the people at the next election. What have we descended to? An important Bill, a Bill that is fastening a system of schools for all time upon millions of people who are not yet in the Territories; such a Bill is to be driven through the House by the impassioned appeals of the Prime Minister, by the threats of the Finance Minister and by the persuasive eloquence of my hon. friend from Brockville who tries to stiffen the backs of gentlemen opposite by wagering dollars on the result of the next election. Shades of George Brown; if Edward Blake or Alexander MacKenzie came into this House of Commons, how they would sigh for these degenerate days when Liberal leaders can make such appeals for the support of a great constitutional measure. And if this were not enough, my benevolent friend the Minister of Customs rises and he cries for, peace, perfect peace. There was no argument in his speech which all through was pervaded with the one sentence: brethren there should be perfect peace, and he ended by saying that he loved the premier and by the love he bore him he could not possibly oppose his will. Is that the serious way in which important legislation should be treated. The Minister of Customs excelled himself that night in his eulogy of the Prime Minister; he had only to go one better to equal the member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) who in a spontaneous outburst of enthusiasm declared that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the greatest man that ever lived. Napoleon may have been a great general, but he was nothing to Laurier; Vanderbilt may have been a Napoleon of finance, but he was not in it with Laurier. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be inoculated with the idea that whenever they address parliament they must raise a paen of idol worship to the Prime Minister. I had not the honour of being in the House when Sir John A. Macdonald was Prime Minister, but I have read a great many of the speeches delivered then, and it may have been that Sir John Macdonald

Mr. BENNETT.

stood so prominent in this country that his followers did not feel it necessary to advertise him as a great man. But the debate proceeds, and now and then we have a gentleman like my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Kennedy) who gets up and does the acrobatic feat. He balances on both sides; he starts out by denouncing separate schools as the curse of the country and he winds up by saying that for the sake of perfect peace he will vote for the government. And then last but not least we have the Minister of Agriculture who gave to us bigots from Ontario a lesson in peace and conciliation.

I was rather surprised that the Postmaster General did not take up the cudgels as an Ontario representative, and deal the city of Toronto a body-blow too, and denounce that city as a hot-bed of bigotry and intolerance. But, Sir, if the Postmaster General did not do it, his understudy from North Ontario did it to his heart's content. I do not wonder that these hon. gentlemen have no feeling of kindness towards the city of Toronto, in which they always thought they had such magnificent voting chances, where in 1896 Mr. Lount was elected by a handsome majority in the same riding which Mr. Bertram a year or two afterwards succeeded in carrying by a considerable majority. The fact of the matter is that the Ontario representation in this cabinet is so weak and this policy of the government is so weak that they dare not make any attempt to carry a Toronto constituency. But my hon. friend the Minister of Customs says: Peace, perfect peace. Does the hon. gentleman believe that majorities have no rights in this country—that we are always to yield to the will of the minority? Does he not know that the old rule must prevail, that the majority should rule? How does he expect that there is going to be peace in this country if, when the majority have the law and the constitution behind them, they are expected to pander to the wishes of some politicians who want to retain their positions as Cabinet ministers, with the accompanying salaries, and in return are to have the support of a lot of hon. gentlemen who are to seek seclusion in a few years in fat government offices? I need not go into the question of who are to be rewarded. An object lesson has been presented in the person of the Minister of the Interior who could go out and revile and denounce this government in every possible manner for the Yukon Bill and other measures, exactly as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals denounced the government, and then, by reason of certain qualifications of a geographical and national kind, secure an appointment to office. I am not saying this in a belittling way of the hon. Minister of the Interior, because I think he is far above the average in point of intelligence.

But, Sir, we are told that there are rea-