

lowing in the footsteps of those missionaries, it was to those apostles of religion that they had to turn to for consolation. It is very easy nowadays to ride in a pullman car and gaze out of its windows at the beautiful prairie, but you must not forget the hardships and the anxieties and the sacrifices which those men made who went into that country first, who went there alone, having nobody to depend upon but themselves. Those men, I repeat, have acquired individual rights and are entitled to the request of our legislators. And if so far the people in the Territories to-day have thought that these men were entitled to their own school systems, why should we take it upon ourselves to decide that they are not. The hon. member for North Toronto asked why did not the Prime Minister prevent in 1896 the robbery of the minorities rights? Well, it was not for the First Minister to prevent it. That was the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they thought that an injustice was being done, why did they not veto the legislation instead of throwing upon individuals the onus of pleading against the local government. If the late Conservative government had vetoed the legislation of the province of Manitoba, and the provincial legislature considered that in so doing they had exceeded their jurisdiction, then there would have been a fairer fight. It was the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to have prevented the wrongdoing, but they did not; and all we could do, after the harm was done, was to apply a remedy.

Let us hope this debate shall soon be at an end and that this little flurry of disagreement, this little wave which looked rather wicked at the top, will soon subside. The ground taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is in defence of provincial rights. And they talk much about these young provinces. Well, though the provinces are young, I think they know best what they want. And the election of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is a fair indication of the sentiment of the Northwest. The fact that the Conservative party has not offered any opposition to the return of the Minister of the Interior surely indicates that hon. gentlemen opposite have found that they have entered upon slippery ground and that the further they go in the same direction the more slippery it becomes.

It has been well said that the measure before us is a very important one. I trust that the two new provinces to which autonomy will be given on the 1st of July will develop rapidly and become great. And I trust that with their admission into the union as provinces we shall have heard the last of race and creed differences in this Dominion. I think it was wise on the part of the Prime Minister and his cabinet to take such steps as we may hope, will settle these questions once for all. The people who are flocking into these new provinces go there for business, and, under good in-

stitutions, their work in developing the natural resources of that country will materially aid in building up a grand and prosperous nation. By helping to prevent the recurrence of such questions as those before us to-day we also shall do our share, for we shall establish a basis for concord, a basis upon which we can all unite in maintaining the peace and increasing the prosperity of our Dominion.

Mr. J. HERRON. (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) with reference to the Northwest Territories. I presume he is an old resident of that country by the remarks he has made. But I may say, in beginning, that I think he is a little wide of the mark in some of the statements he has made. He may have resided in Manitoba, but I think he is not familiar with the conditions in the Northwest. He is not the only member of this House who has spoken of settlements made in the Northwest previous to the establishment of the means of law and order. He has said that the missionaries carried on a great work there and that it was followed up by the settlement of the country by those of his race and religion. To that I take a certain exception. I was in that country in the very early days, and I travelled all over the length and breadth of the Northwest Territories south of the great Saskatchewan and east of the Rocky mountains, and I think I am safe in saying that there was no such settlement in that country, certainly none except at the present town of Morley west of Calgary and that was the settlement of a Methodist missionary. There was no French settlement in that country as has been alleged in this House from time to time. Nor, were there, I regret to say, these great establishments of the church which have been referred to. Because, while I did not claim a greater share of the spirit of tolerance than any other hon. member of this House, I may say that I helped to build the first Roman Catholic church that was built between the North Saskatchewan river and the International boundary which embraces the foothills of the Rocky mountains. This was some thirty years ago. Under the circumstances, I think I have the right to take exception to some of the statements that have been made in this House. I admit that at the present time we have a number of French Canadians in the Northwest and, of course, Roman Catholics are there as in every other part of the Dominion. These French Canadians are certainly as good a class of settlers as any others we have. But, when you give them credit for beginning the settlement of the Northwest, I think you go further than is necessary, because that credit is not wholly due them.

Now, in dealing with the school question, I am brought to the same point as that I