

parliament, imposed upon the people, who were bound to carry it into effect, including the ordinances relating to schools.

4. No right arose under the legislation for a continuance of the educational clauses. Those who contend to the contrary must inform us when the statute of limitation, confirming the right, began to run, and when the prescriptive right became complete. There is no such prescriptive right. The people of the territory passed the ordinances in obedience to the law, which they were bound to obey. To argue from that, that the people were in favour of separate schools or had voluntarily adopted the principle is contrary to fact.

5. In granting provincial status to a territory, parliament is bound by the law and the constitution, and cannot withhold full provincial sovereignty under the terms of the constitution. If you can withhold one right of self-government you can go further, so that a province might be compelled to enter the union a dwarf in respect of provincial sovereignty, shackled and shorn of legitimate power for efficient administration and development. Such construction cannot be and I venture to assert is not the frame and intent of the Canadian constitution.

Suppose, however, outside of the law parliament has the power to pass this Bill, then what as to the expediency of passing it? My right hon. friend the First Minister declaimed—and I admire the First Minister for that—against coercing Manitoba. He is doing to-day what he deplored in 1896. Trust the people, do not coerce them; that was the language of the Finance Minister upon the platforms of Nova Scotia in 1896. To him I say to-day: If you could trust the people of Manitoba trust the people of the Northwest Territories, they are not African savages, they will do what is right by their fellow citizens; trust them and leave this legislation in their hands. The people of the west are freemen, or they suppose they are freemen. They hope to be freemen, but let me tell the right hon. gentleman who leads the government that if he forces this legislation upon that country and places these constitutions upon the statute-book against the will of the people of the great west, he will be but sowing the dragons teeth which in the near future must inevitably produce an abundant crop of discontent, of discord and of bitter strife. I have faith in the people of the west as I have faith in the people of the east. I vote for the amendment of the leader of the opposition because it is along the line of liberty and freedom of action for the west; I vote against the proposition of the Prime Minister because it is of the essence of coercion and of distrust in the people of the west.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, in rising to address

171

the House on this question, I must say, at the outset, that I do not intend to speak at any length; it is not customary for me to do so, and besides, I do not wish to detain hon. members who are anxious to get away. But before casting my vote against the amendment introduced by the hon. gentleman whose follower I have had the honour of being heretofore, I think it is incumbent upon me to offer a few personal explanations for the information of hon. gentlemen who are listening to me, and also in justification for myself.

My object, in the first place, is to protest against the unjust warfare carried on, on behalf of prejudice and bigotry, by politicians and newspaper men belonging to either party. It behooves, Sir, members of parliament and men of mature thought to direct public opinion in the right channels. It is a matter of deep regret for me to find that in my province, as well as in other provinces, newspapers are endeavouring to set the various races at war against each other, and that solely with a view to political gain. I regret to read, from day to day, in the Ontario papers, whether Conservative or Liberal, Tory or Grit, attacks such as you may have read yourself, Mr. Speaker, against Catholics in this country and their clergy. Catholics, and the Catholic hierarchy as well, are above such attacks and such insults, and I shall not lose time in defending them.

But, Mr. Speaker, what aggrieves me much more than these attacks and insults coming from people who do not know better, it is to find these reproduced in the columns of our French papers, with the object of making our people believe that these attacks are not confined to certain English-speaking Tories, but are engineered by the Conservative party as a whole. I am deeply aggrieved to find that, in a purely partisan spirit, these newspapers are endeavouring to set up the peaceful inhabitants of Quebec against the English-speaking and Protestant Conservatives in general. Now, is that racial and religious warfare—which, after all, as any fair-minded man will have to admit, is not as widespread as some contend—is that racial and religious warfare carried on exclusively by Tories? Have you not, Mr. Speaker, heard, as I have in this House, only a few days ago, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), ex-Minister of the Interior, the same man who, during two parliaments, has had charge of one of the most important of our public departments, boast of his having been the principal means of abolishing the use of the French language as well as the Catholic schools in Manitoba? Have we not heard him claim such conduct as his most glorious feat? Did not the 'Globe,' the leading Liberal organ in the province of Ontario, publish, on the 20th of April last, the following lines, which I quote from an article too lengthy to be given here in toto: