a common standpoint where their differences will vanish, both sides may agree to a fair and just and equitable compromise. That was the basis of the settlement of the Manitoba school question. But, Sir, to say that because that was the settlement, and that it was on the whole satisfactory to both sides of the controversy at that time, does not mean that under any circumstances in the future, or under a new condition of affairs existing in the adjoining new provinces, such a settlement must necessarily be absolutely satisfactory for ever. We have a totally different condition of affairs in regard to our school legislation in the new provinces. We have a new start to be made. We have a condition of affairs existing today in these Territories which gives certain rights to the minorities in the way of separate schools. To maintain these rights by our legislation, we give in the future a guarantee that these rights shall be maintained. Some people may consider that the condition in the Territories is not better, nor even so good, as the condition of affairs in Manitoba to-day; but, however that may be, the proposition in this legislation is a settlement of the question. Perhaps, as in the case of Manitoba, you may call it a compromise, and probably the two extremes to the controversy may say that the legislation we propose is not satisfactory, but a compromise has to be reached between these extremes. You cannot get a compromise which will be absolutely acceptable to the extreme adherents of one side or the other, but you may get a compromise which will be acceptable to the common sense of the great mass of the people of this country. I believe that by this Bill we have attained that desirable end.

The question of the boundaries of Manitoba has been discussed, and this question is perhaps the raison d'etre of this whole discussion this afternoon. A complaint is made—perhaps not actually made by anybody on the floor of this House, although it is implied—a complaint is made by Mr. Rogers that the boundaries of Manitoba have not been moved westward, because of the difficulties connected with the school question. There is no justification whatever for any such statement. There are newspaper rumours of all kinds. I regret to say that our friends opposite in their press are quite equal to the manufacture of newspaper rumours of all kinds. I regret to say that they feed on these rumours. They have not much else to feed upon, Mr. Speaker. They have been beaten over and over and over again, when the people of this country have been appealed to and have had an opportunity of pronouncing on their policy and their utterances in comparison with our policy and our utterances. We heard just such language here session after session between 1896 and 1900. We heard that the Liberal government was to be swept out of power in 1900 the moment the people had an opportunity of judging our record and our policy. We all know the result. All through the last parliament we had hon. gentlemen opposite talking very loudly in this House about what they were going to do when the elections came on. They impressed a good many people in the country. They are loud-mouthed and denunciatory; and they are like some people who think that by saying a thing very often you actually make it true. But the result of the election in November, 1904, showed them that their loudest denunciations and loudest assertions were mere empty wind, and the government came back with a larger majority than any party in Canada had got in many years.

An hon. MEMBER. Where was their leader?

Mr. FISHER. I will not say anything about that; I do not wish to indulge in personalities. But in that connection I would like to refer to a statement which I saw in a Conservative newspaper within the last day or two—I am sorry I cannot remember which paper it was. The statement was that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Quebec were inferior in intelligence and superior in bigotry and prejudice to the people of Ontario. It is easy enough to see where a sentiment of that kind comes from; it comes from the disappointed ambitions of men who tried to be elected in those provinces and had to suffer the defeat which their party and their policy deserved.

There is one thing more which I wish to say a few words about; and, coming as I do from the province of Quebec, perhaps I know a little more about these matters than the great mass of English speaking or Protestant members of this House. It may be a little delicate for one who does not belong to the Roman Catholic church to speak about the action of Catholics in regard to their own church, or about the difficulties which may have arisen in the internal economy of that church in this country. But, having lived among the Catholics of the province of Quebec, it may not be out of place for me to say a word or two in regard to the coming of the Papal ablegate. In 1896 a request was made by certain people belonging to the Catholic church for a permanent representative of the Pope in Canada. That was not the first time that a request of that kind had been placed before the head of the Catholic church. Those of us who can look back a little in the history of this country can remember the condition of affairs in the province of Quebec before 1896. We can remember that as long ago as 1876 there was an election in the province of Quebec, in which it was notorious that leading dignitaries of the Catholic church took an active part—such an active part that the Tory candidate in that election was elected; such an active