

hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), are willing that we should impose on the people of the Northwest Territories for all time to come the incubus of that legislation. If we are going outside of our powers in trying to maintain the Act of 1875, in the matter of education, how is it that we are acting within our powers in maintaining the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway as regards the taxation of property in those Territories? At different intervals, while listening to the speech of the hon. the leader of the opposition on the second reading of this Bill, I was reminded of a saying of Sir Charles Tupper. And of Sir Charles this must be said, and I think it will be admitted on both sides, whatever may be our views regarding him in other respects, that he was always frank and outspoken. He never tried to shelter himself behind small texts of law. I well remember a sentence he uttered once during the debate on the Manitoba school question. Being taunted one day with not being versed in the law and being told that he had better not mix himself up with those legal texts, the old gentleman said: If to be a lawyer means that one must confine himself to texts of law and forget the difference between truth and untruth, I thank Heaven I am not a lawyer. Sir, at one part of the speech of the leader of the opposition I was forcibly reminded of that declaration of his predecessor. It was when turning to the Orange section of his party—I would rather not refer to the fact but it was patent to everybody—he said: If the government will show me a written contract in the case of education such as exists in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am ready to abide by its maintenance. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that in his study of texts and legal quibbles, my hon. friend has forgotten one of the basic principles of law, and that is that the written document is not the contract. What is really the contract is the agreement entered into between the two parties, and the written document is only the evidence of that agreement. I will go further. Written contracts were invented by legislators when men became dishonest enough not to be true to their pledges and in order to guard against dishonesty. But if we are bound by our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers are not strong enough to oppose the Canadian Pacific Railway, are we not bound by a far greater bond to the minority in the west, if there is any sense of justice and honour in this parliament? Are we not bound by the promise made by the highest statesmen of this country to the fathers of families who settled in these Territories, relying on the word of honour of the Canadian parliament? Are we not bound in honour by the word given to two millions of our fellow subjects of His Majesty, that in those Territories, which were bought with their money as well

as the money of the majority, the rights of the minority, the freedom of conscience of the minority would be respected? This is a fact which should not be forgotten. Without going again into a deep and fine study of the question whether those Territories became part of the union in 1870 or whether those new provinces are entering the union now, there is one thing we know, and that is that they were purchased and paid for by the people of Canada as a whole. We know that every dollar which has been spent on the development of that country, we know that the millions of dollars which have been expended to bring foreign people into it, were contributed by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is one principle upon which I think we can safely appeal to the spirit of justice of any English speaking majority, it is that every man is equal before the collector of taxes. Therefore I say that when we are considering the rights and the law and the constitution, this very simple fact should not be forgotten. May I not go a little further? May I not make a special appeal, not to my compatriots but to the English speaking majority of this parliament, to pause and consider a little what the French Canadians have done for the opening up and development of that country.

When the English settlers of His Majesty were still on the banks of the Atlantic and had not crossed the Ohio and the Missouri, French Canadian priests, French Canadian traders and settlers had opened up that country. I shall go further. If there is one thing which ought to make a Canadian proud of his country, it is the contrast between the relations that have existed in Canada between the white and the red men and those relations which have existed between these two races in the neighbouring republic. Admitting that some credit is due to the policy of the government, long before governments existed, long before any law was introduced into that country, Catholic priests had gone there; and if those pioneers of Christian faith had not 200 years ago gone into that country to preach the law of charity and Christian civilization, we would have had repeated in Canada the same sad lamentable story of wars between the white and the red man which has marked the history of the United States. The peace of this western country of ours has been due to the good seed of charity, civilization and enlightenment which was sown there years ago by the members of that hierarchy which is now trying to impose its will upon the tender consciences of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and Mr. Haultain. Let me proceed further, and point out that in 1870 there was a rebellion in that country, and a rebellion which has been justified by history and by the testimony of many public men. On what did the government of Canada then rely to appease those people? Did it rely on