

ical point as to securing the best education possible for your children :

To rural districts an amount to be calculated as follows :

(a) To each district containing 6,400 acres or less of assessable land as shown by the last revised roll of the district, \$1.20 for each day school is kept open ; to each district containing less than 6,400, as aforesaid, one cent more per day for each 160 acres or fractional part thereof less than 6,400 acres ; and to each district containing more than 6,400 acres as aforesaid, one cent less per day for each additional 60 acres or fractional part thereof.

Mr. SCOTT. That ordinance is not embodied in the Bill.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is the one officially sent to me.

Mr. L. G. MCCARTHY. It is not embodied in the Bill.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I see that. But I gave this merely to illustrate how the Act must work out for a similar ordinance must be passed. Here is the point I want to make : Certain grants are made out of the public treasury for these schools. Take a rural school section, of, say, 6,400 acres. A certain amount of money will go to that section. Now, simply as a practical illustration of what would arise under the ordinance—

Mr. SCOTT. But what purpose is to be served by giving such an illustration when there is no provision of that kind in the Bill ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I suppose that when the public moneys are to be distributed under this Bill, they must be distributed equitably among the public and separate schools. If a certain amount of money is to go to one section, and there is only one school, that school will get more than it would if another school were established in the same section. That, I think, is self evident. I expressly said that I gave this as an illustration of how it would work out. I suppose it will be admitted that, as that country is sparsely settled, it must be rather hard, in many sections, to maintain the schools. If another school is started in the neighbourhood, a heavy burden is placed upon both classes of the community and the schools are less efficient than they otherwise would be. I have another reason. I was in the Northwest about two years ago. I found regions which foreigners, as for instance the Galicians, have come in and settled. Now, if the Galicians get control of the school in one section, is it more likely or is it less likely that Americans, let us say, will settle there under the proposed legislation than they would if the public school only could be established there ? As a practical question is it not clear that the moment a number of foreigners settle in one section, they will effectively exclude

Mr. NORTHRUP.

other people settling in that section unless they are prepared to accept the conditions that would be suitable to foreigners ? Take, for instance the Galicians, and speaking of them with all respect. Is it unfair to say that the children of Galicians not knowing a word of English, would not be regarded as the most profitable fellow-students at school for the children of a farmer coming from the south side of the line. Therefore I venture to say that the idea of splitting up the schools is not calculated to improve the class of immigrants coming into the country and that it will practically shut out from the country a great deal of a certain and excellent class of immigration.

I have tried calmly and quietly to call the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that a majority may have feelings as well as a minority, and that it would be well in all these matters to consider the feelings of the majority as well as the feelings of the minority. I trust, Sir, that since it has been admitted on both sides of the House that painful excitement exists in the country, that fears have been aroused and passions excited, that probably many long days will be required to quell, I think I am justified in view of these facts admitted on both sides of the House, in appealing to the right hon. gentleman to tell us what is meant, and either say that the Finance Minister was wrong in his definition, or if he stands by what he says and calls it right, then let us here to-night, before we leave this chamber, settle on terms which will be satisfactory to every one of the majority in Canada who would gladly see all the children of this country trained every day in the year, for half an hour or more, in the faith taught them by their fathers.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton). If I have the permission of the leader of the opposition, whom I am sorry to see is not now in his place, to venture a few remarks in regard to what is especially a Northwest question, I would like to take up the time of the House for a little while to-night. That gentleman has several times referred to an occasion of two years ago when he saw fit to bring before this House a motion in regard to provincial autonomy, and it has seemed a grievance to him that on that occasion he was replied to by a humble member representing part of the Northwest Territories instead of by a member of the government. I do not know what qualification the hon. leader of the opposition demands from members who address this House, but I would think, with all humility, that a member who has spent the greater part of his life in the Northwest Territories, who had some part in the local government of the Territories for many years, might possibly be able to contribute something to the information of the House on a question so closely connected