

parts of Canada with their coming millions of population, and their conditions in years and centuries to come, as diverse from this year and this century as the human mind can imagine. It is a task which is unwise to essay; it is absolutely impossible of successful accomplishment. The right hon. gentleman may tag on this badge of bondage; he may put on his restrictions; he may utter an irrevocable decree of tutelage, but I tell him that, against the free thought and free will of these two provinces with their coming millions of people, his statute of limitation will be as waste paper and his chains of bondage as weak as thread of fibre. There is no hand which can fashion the chain and drive the rivet that will encompass and restrict these young giants of the Northwest in years to come. You may carry your project through and the Finance Minister may cry peace, peace, but the moment it is carried through and made irrevocable, that moment begins against it the warfare of an unwilling people. The feelings of free men that their right to freedom has been outraged and denied will not long lie dormant. Tolerant, if you appeal to his love of tolerance, the free man will forswear tolerance if you attempt to force upon him by superior and to a certain extent foreign and outside force, a measure which he believes restricts his freedom. Do not run away with the conclusion that we here are able to shackle the millions of the future in the Northwest.

What answer have you in face of the fact that every other province has this liberty, and has treated with remarkable toleration the minority within its boundaries—vaunted and boasted in every part of this House? What right have you to say to the people of the Northwest: We can trust our fellow-citizens in the other provinces, but we cannot trust you. More illogical still, the member for Labelle said: We could trust the people who are there now. Trust the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who voted over and over again for resolutions to destroy the rights of the minority in the Northwest? Trust the member for Brandon, who has abandoned his principles for the sake of his party's success, but who, in the very moment that he abandons them, still plucks up courage to say, I believe in them still, I am proud of my allegiance to them? You can trust these, but you cannot trust the coming peoples of the Northwest. Never was there a more retrograde doctrine taught by the greatest Tory of the ages than is taught in that sentence by the hon. member for Labelle.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman is stating just the contrary of what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman say what he said?

Mr. BOURASSA. I said that even if I trusted the people at present in the North-

Mr. FOSTER.

west, no one could tell what would happen in the future, when large numbers of people from the United States and other countries settled there; and, so far as the present rulers of the Northwest were concerned, I said I could not trust them in the light of their past legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. If the member for Labelle said that, then I misunderstood him, and my argument does not apply to him. I want only fair argument. There was an argument which somewhat cut the ground from under the feet of the member for Labelle. He said: Put separate schools into the Northwest and treat the French people well and the French people will flow into the Northwest and become your most stable settlers, lovers of the soil, as the French people always are, lovers of their home, as they are wherever they settle. But does the hon. member recollect that into the country to the south of us, with its Godless schools, its secular schools, its denial of the French language and all other rights of the minority, hundreds of thousands of the choice youth of the province of Quebec have gone and go from year to year to make their homes? Will the restriction, if you put it upon the Northwest, in principle unjust and in practice irksome, be worth the paper it is written upon? Under the ordinances as they are to-day rules are made by the commissioners. You do not crystallize one of those regulations into law. You simply provide that the ordinance shall stand, and the ordinance with reference to separate schools is absolutely the same as the provision in the law of 1875. Why is it that to-day those schools are not the same as they were twenty years ago? Because with the power to make regulations which the commissioner has under these ordinances, regulations have been made which have transformed those schools into what they are to-day. Pass your ordinance and put it into the constitution, and if the people of the Northwest, in their provincial assemblies, are opposed to the principle, are opposed to reverting to the old form, they will make their regulations as they please, and I would like to know how you propose to stop them. It is absolutely impossible.

All this discussion, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to say so, seems out of place in this House. To discuss the school systems of the United States, of Spain, of Germany, of France, of these provinces, to try to settle which has the greatest merits in all its principles and details, is something that is absolutely foreign to this House, and that never should be brought here—has no place here legitimately. As I said before, the plea may be good, but you are in the wrong court. To the province you should go for these tolerant privileges, these rights which you wish to have by law. The province alone can give them, and, as the ex-Minister of the Interior said the other day: 'I