

foresight could, I suppose, have prevented it. New provinces had to be created, and when they were created the question of their educational rights would have to come up; Statesmanship does not cover before a problem of that kind. It meets it in a bold and statesmanlike way. We who represent the people of different creeds and races have to meet it in this House, and whilst we have our opinions and hold them strongly and express them boldly, we will not, I hope, offend even the most sensitive of those who do not agree with us on questions of creed or race.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to carry this further to-night. I am going to reiterate what I think the right hon. gentleman ought to take into consideration. He ought to fill up his vacant or dormant cabinet positions, especially the one in which is needed a representative of the Northwest people, whose interests are being legislated upon; and I hope the right hon. gentleman will revise the statement which he made a few days ago, that he does not propose to give his attention to that matter at the present time. I think it ought to be done; we on this side of the House think it ought to be done; I believe the people of the great Northwest think it ought to be done. Deprived of their own champion and representative in this matter, they do at least ask the government of the day to give them another representative through whom they can voice their opinions. It is not enough to say to that great country and the million of people who are there: Give your views to us, and we will take them into consideration. Everybody knows that even a representative cannot go where a minister goes. The formative process is in the cabinet itself, and it is difficult to decide upon what is not formulated in the cabinet. Therefore I say the west needs its representative, needs its champion. How inadequate was the argument of my right hon. friend that there was no objection to any part of this Bill but one clause. Suppose we take that for granted, will not my right hon. friend admit that that one clause is the great clause for this whole Dominion as well as for the Northwest? If public opinion centres, with unerring aim and unerring sense of right, upon the one great essential clause, is that an argument for saying that all the rest of a multiplicity of enactments are satisfactory and find no dissentients in the Northwest or anywhere else in this country? It is simply that this one overshadows the others, but that there are others my right hon. friend knows and he will know still better as this discussion goes on. He will find out one thing I think and that is that his financial terms, as he has placed them in this Bill, will bring upon him every province in this Dominion. Already the mutterings are in that direction, already the tendency is clearly discernible. Take it on any ground

Mr. FOSTER.

you like and by the proportions which you have meted out to the Northwest and you have gone beyond the financial conditions of every other province of this Dominion. That is why the Minister of Finance, I think, should have been here and should have been considered when this Bill was in preparation. But my right hon. friend will find that there are other clauses besides the educational clause which will be brought up.

Now what has the right hon. gentleman told us? He gave us the wonderful information the other day that amendments are very often made to Bills and that they are very often made as the Bills go through committee. He did not say whether he was going to amend the Bill or not. To-day he rather foreshadowed an amendment. The right hon. gentleman came out without its being necessary or constitutional, three weeks, four weeks, five weeks, out of due season and ahead of time, burned all his bridges behind him and made an impassioned argument for the four chief points of his Bill. He nailed his colours to the mast, and he declared that he would have the courage once his convictions were formed to stand by those convictions. What said he in 1895?

Well, Sir, to be wanting in courage is a grave charge I admit. But if to make promises and not to implement them is courage, if to make threats and to quail before their consequences is courage, if to be boisterous in language and meek in action is courage, if to pass an order and refuse to execute it is courage, if to act in such a manner as to force your best friends to the conviction that you are deceiving them is courage, there is a galaxy of courageous men on the treasury benches before us, such as we have not seen for a long time. Sir, courage is a noble thing in itself, but foresight is not to be despised either. Foresight is not to be despised in such a country as this, with all its conflicting elements. My courage is not of the kind of courage possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite, I admit. My courage is not to make hasty promises and then to ignominiously break them. My courage is to speak slowly, but once I have spoken to stand or fall by my words.

That is the right hon. gentleman's answer to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to the people of the Northwest, to the people of this broad Dominion: 'I have foresight; I have used it. That Bill is the result of it. In that I have made my promise and mine is the sterling courage which never goes back on its promises.'

We will see, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). It is not necessary for me Mr. Speaker, to say that I have no desire to follow my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) on the path on which he has entered. I have no desire to do it because I think it would entail a useless waste of time in the first