

mained to them are existing at the present day, and claim is made and made with great force and I think with a force that should be given proper consideration that it is impossible to grant privileges of this kind, to allow them to remain in force for many years, to allow the people in the country to grow up with them and then to arbitrarily or unnecessarily remove them without grave cause. I know that it is claimed that the law of 1875 was a temporary law, that it could have been abrogated or repealed by this parliament at any time and that this parliament could do so to-day. That is true, but this parliament has not done so and the law has remained in force. I know also that it is impossible to bind future generations by an Act of the present. I know that the present generation, if it found any special law or even bargain, passed by our great grandfathers, to be particularly irksome would feel bound to honour it. If it had to be so, if we were positively bound by every bargain, possibly entered into in good faith by our great grandfathers, there would be no progress made in this world, nothing could be changed. But on the present occasion, I do not feel that there have been any special changes in the situation that would warrant us in departing from the policy which has been followed in the past in regard to the privileges of the minority in the Northwest Territories. I feel that if I were in a legislative body that was properly empowered to deal with the matter and I felt assured of the power of that legislative body to deal with it, and this question coming before me, it would be impossible to pass over the vested rights, if I may call them so, and the customs of thirty years unless there could be shown the very gravest reasons of state for doing so. I was interested a short time ago in a discussion which I had with a Roman Catholic friend in regard to these schools, to hear him say that although there had been a great deal of legislation from time to time and although apparently privileges were given to Roman Catholic minorities in regard to schools they had failed to get what they expected or what they thought the law gave them and that it was the shadow and not the substance which they had obtained. I was rather surprised at that declaration and I endeavoured to look into the events in regard to education in the various provinces and see if they would substantiate it. In looking over the legislation in regard to education, first, in the province of Ontario, I felt that the claim was not a good one. In the province of Ontario I believe that the compact of confederation in regard to separate schools has been honourably kept. More than that I find that the law in that respect has been amended in such a way as to increase the usefulness and proper working of the Act in regard to separate schools. When I look into the question as it affects the province of Que-

Mr. McINTYRE.

bec, and when I listened to speeches such as we have heard from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and others, I realize that the compact there has been honourably kept in regard to minorities. When I look into the question in regard to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in which no special provision had been made and in which at one time there appeared to have been a little friction I realize that a *modus vivendi* has been found, that, as far as we can judge is satisfactory; so that in all these provinces there appears to be no ground for this complaint that I refer to. But, when I come to Manitoba and the west the question takes on a different appearance. Our Roman Catholic friends claim, and I am afraid they claim with a considerable amount of force, that they have not received entirely what they are entitled to, and I cannot say that the record in the province is satisfactory in regard to the form assumed by the legislation, or in regard to the reasonable way in which the legislation has been introduced, or in regard to the way in which the compacts of legislation have been adhered to. And when I come to the Northwest Territories that are in question now and consider the privileges given by the law of 1875 and the infringements, if I may call them so, of these privileges by the later ordinances, I say again there is some ground for the complaint. In the consideration of the question it struck me that there is a reason and that reason, I think, is largely found in this fact that the provinces coming together and specifically entering into a bargain as provinces, knowing what they had to do, have honourably kept that bargain, but when you come to provinces such as Manitoba and the Territories of the Northwest, who, themselves, have not been parties to the bargain, and who have been legislated for rather than legislating for themselves, there is a difference in their attitude. There is an antagonism against any restraints we may put upon them, and I think in the very action of this province and these Territories, there is a warning to us as to the manner in which we shall be wise to deal with them and with this question.

When this Bill was first brought forward in the very able speech by the Prime Minister, I thought possibly from the remarks of the leader of the opposition that it might not lead to much political antagonism, but that hope was not borne out by subsequent happenings. Some striking events followed the introduction of the Bill. There was in a portion of our country quite an agitation against it, and perhaps the most remarkable thing that happened was the resignation of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) on account of his objection to the first draft of the Bill. That was even a more marked event than would have been on the resignation of some other member of the government, because of Mr.