

owing to the attitude taken by the Liberals in the Dominion of Canada. It is owing to the attitude taken by the Liberals in the province of Manitoba. Every pledge that the Liberals gave in the province of Manitoba they have broken. Let us go back to their pledges in regard to the legislative council. They said to the people in that province: Abolish the legislative council and your rights will be protected. They had no sooner got the minority in that province to consent to the abolition of the legislative council of Manitoba than they started to do away with the rights which the minority had in that province. That was the first trouble. That occurred in 1890. We next hear of this trouble coming up in our Dominion parliament in 1892 again in 1894 and I shall refer in a moment to the debates which took place in those years in this House. I am not saying that it was the Manitoba trouble which came up in 1892 or 1894, but I do say that the trouble which took place in the province of Manitoba in 1890 led to the trouble which afterwards arose in 1892 and 1894, and was largely responsible for the agitation which we had in the province of Ontario, an agitation which I am bound to say did so great credit to our province, an agitation however, in which the Protestants were not unreasonable; they were fair as was shown by the result of that agitation. Now let me refer to a statement that was made by the late Sir John Thompson during the debate in 1892. He said:

One other important characteristic was to be considered in regard to the Territories while they were to remain in the Territorial condition, and that was in view of the peculiar circumstances of the Territories, the fact that we were inviting all races, creeds and denominations, there was to be the widest toleration while the Territories existed.

That was the corner stone of the whole; the corner stone which the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) proposes to remove, on the ground that there can be no good reason given for its existence. As the hon. leader of the opposition has said to-night, no man knew better than those who were engaged in framing the Act of 1875, the difficulties which sectarian disputes might create in that new country. No one realized better the fact, that in so far as the population was to be gathered into the Territories from the older provinces, it was to be gathered from different races, and from amongst men who had strong lines of difference as regards religious belief. While the population should be going in there, and while the Territories should remain under our control at least, there was to be the broadest toleration for every belief, and for the races, as regards worship, and as regards language, and as regards instruction in the schools.

Then further he says:

It is just as much a matter of sound policy now as it was in 1875, that toleration should exist there, and that we should extend the broadest invitation to the people of different
Mr. PRINGLE.

races and religions to come and settle there with a perfect sense of toleration; and it matters not how many people in the past have availed themselves of our invitation. The bad faith this parliament would show in repealing a provision of that kind, while the territorial system existed at least, would be just as great as if the population who availed themselves of our pledge and relied on that system to-day were only thirteen instead of 13,000.

The population at that time was 13,000; as I understand it to-day it is some 500,000, of whom 125,000 are Roman Catholics. Then further he says:

We claim therefore that the constitutional system which was established with regard to schools and with regard to language in 1875 ought to be maintained for the same reasons as those which dictated its creation, and that this condition of affairs should last, at least, while the affairs of the Territories are under control of this parliament. What the constitution of the future provinces should be, in view of the pledges which have been referred to, or in view of any other set of circumstances, will be for parliament to decide when it decides to create those provinces. I hope, therefore, that the House will be careful to-day not to disturb the arrangement so wisely made in 1875, and which is as useful to the Territories now as it was then.

These are the words of Sir John Thompson, then leader of the Conservative party and Attorney General of Canada. Now let me see what the reply of Mr. Dalton McCarthy is to this:

Then if we do not give them power to choose, if we deny them the right to select for themselves, then, when the day comes, as it must before long, when some part of the Territories will ask for admission and be entitled by their population and position to have this clause enacted, then this parliament would be bound to repeal the law, otherwise we should be, as I say, riveting the system of separate schools upon them. This point I think a most important one.

There was a long discussion in regard to the motion of the late Dalton McCarthy to give the power to the Northwest Territories to abolish their system of separate schools, but the position taken by Sir John Thompson was as I have just read and we know the result of the vote. The vote was 114 to 21. It was considered not wise to change the conditions that existed in those Territories and why? Largely because in 1875 when the Northwest Territories Act was framed, it was conceded that we were putting this clause in so that the people who were coming into those Territories might know exactly what the laws would be in the Territories in regard to their schools. It is suggested now by some that we wipe out these rights absolutely. It is suggested by others that we leave it entirely to the provinces to deal with, but the position taken as I say in 1894 was that it was wise to leave it just as it stood at that time, and when the provinces were to be created the