

the Roman Catholic minority is unfounded. Both cannot be correct. Perhaps my hon. friend from East Grey, in his supreme desire to do justice, will, in talking the matter over with his western friends, point out to them the view which the Quebec Tories take of this measure as compared with that which he and his friends take. But what is the attitude of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition? He simply takes his stand on provincial rights. The hon. member for East Grey does the passion part of the play. He acts the tragic role and appeals to passion; other members of the party opposite indulge in melodramatic appeals to sentiment; others attempt more or less skilfully to excite prejudice, but one and all they are working to the same end, and that is the success and glory of the Conservative party, no matter by what means that may be secured. But there is one thing which these gentlemen might well bear in mind. It is that the welfare of this country depends on our people living in harmony; and let this question be once settled in a broad spirit of tolerant justice and we will continue in that career of progress in which we have been advancing for the last eight years. For several years during the agitation accompanying the Manitoba school question, the progress of this country was stopped, and stopped it would be again if the opposition could have their way and succeed in throwing this question into the arena of political strife. But the good sense of parliament, I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, will prevail, and the country will breathe a sigh of relief when this question is settled for all time, without any sacrifice of principle on either side and in a manner which will enable all classes to live in harmony. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that because the Act of 1875 was passed when there were only 500 people in the Northwest it should now be done away with when there are 500,000 people in that country. But it seems to me that if 500,000 people have gone into that country, knowing the law and the conditions which prevailed, they furnish us with 500,000 arguments in favour of the maintenance of the status quo. Why should we deal with the people of the Territories when we make them a province in a different manner from that in which we deal with the people in other provinces when they were brought into confederation? What we propose now is in harmony with the unbroken practice in similar cases, respected in every part of this broad Dominion. Therefore, I am unable to understand why, when we are raising these two Territories to the dignity of provinces this agitation should be excited. Some time ago, in reading a history of India, I came across a passage which might very well be brought to the attention of this House. Speaking of the treatment by Great Britain of the many nationalities throughout her broad empire—races with-

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

out number and creeds without number—the writer said that he had yet to find an instance of the mother country having ever oppressed a minority or failed to recognize the beliefs and feelings and sentiments and even the prejudices of that minority. And when at the close of the great mutiny in India, it was said that the imperial government might interfere with the religious views of the people, Her Majesty herself caused a proclamation to be issued to the people of India in which she pointed out that she had derived so much comfort and consolation from her own religion that she would never allow hands to be laid on the religions or creeds of the various great tribes that composed her loyal citizens throughout India.

And, go where you will throughout this broad empire, with its four hundred millions of people of different races and different creeds, you find all left in the enjoyment of those things that they regard as sacred. It is that policy, that method of treating the people, that has made Great Britain's empire, what it is to-day—wide-spread, powerful and stable, resting upon the affections of the whole people and holding the people together by the bonds of affection and not by force or coercion. If our own Dominion is to be held together we cannot do better than follow the example of the mother of nations and yield, if need be, occasionally to prejudices or sentiments involving no sacrifice of principle in order to enable the different classes that are coming to our shores to live in peace, in harmony and in the enjoyment of those institutions to which they attach great importance and the enjoyment of which by them makes them more loyal citizens, yet does no injury to the common welfare.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is to apologize, unless I do—for I suppose the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) will not—for the time that hon. gentleman has taken up in what was supposed to have been a discussion of Bill (No. 69) now before the House. I must say that I sympathize with those gentlemen supporting, or supposed to be supporting, the Postmaster General who have been brought back this evening to hear, as they supposed, a reply to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and who, after trying to listen for half an hour or so, were obliged to leave the Chamber because they could not understand where the Postmaster General was or what subject he was dealing with. I sympathize with them, because we cannot blame them for thinking the Postmaster General would give them some information or some light—something which they could take to their constituents and offer as an apology or plea for forgiveness for their vote against the contentions of the hon. member for North Toronto. And what has the Post-