

question of dogma, as one who does not want to grow up in enmity with his Roman Catholic neighbour; as one who does not want to pass through the world with the people divided on creed lines, I maintain that when we coerce the provinces to accept these separate schools, we are retarding for ever the wheels of progress and the up-building of the national life within these provinces. I do not think the union of church and state is for the best interests of humanity. The nations of the old land have given it up, and why this young country should adopt the fads and practices that have been discarded in Europe is beyond my comprehension. I am opposed to this parliament forcing on any province, against its will, a union of church and state. By the enactment of this law, this parliament is placing a blanket mortgage on the two provinces of the Northwest which will remain on them to the end of time and which can never be paid off. I object in general terms to this legislation. It is contrary to the spirit of a free parliament; it is contrary to the spirit of a free people. I am afraid that I shall not be able to bring to bear on this great question the deeply sanctified and the emotional Christian spirit displayed by the Prime Minister; nor the stern, defiant, aggressive militant Christianity of the Minister of Justice; nor the humility and the contrition the holy-dread and sackcloth-and-ashes demeanour of the Minister of Finance; nor the fervid sanctimoniousness and brotherly love of the Minister of Customs; nor the speculative religion—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Who wrote that for you?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I composed that myself after observing the exhibition made by the ministers. I may say, Sir, that I got it in a reflective mood, and after the beautiful exhibition of christian spirit and brotherly love displayed here one evening by the Minister of Justice, I went home and reflected and this is the result.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You should reflect oftener.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps so. The Minister of Justice on that occasion displayed on the floor of parliament all the old time characteristics of the Champlain street youngster, and he displayed them to the great edification of the people of this country. Nor, Sir, can I bring to bear on this question the speculative opinions of the Postmaster General, who has had such an ample training working hand in hand with the Protestant Protective Association organization of the province of Ontario throughout the length and breadth of many constituencies. Nor can I bring to bear on this subject the illogical fancicism or the sparkling distortion of established facts displayed by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I shall endeavour to discuss these questions

without any appeal to prejudice, but simply on the basis of what are the facts, and what is for the best interests of the people of the Territories which are being erected into two provinces, and for the best interests of the people of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Now, I trust that the Prime Minister will excuse me for bringing to his mind some of his old speeches. In this connection, I may say that the young gentleman from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) struck the Prime Minister a very heavy blow beneath the belt when, in referring to the hon. member for North Toronto, he said that a man of principles always stuck to his principles, and never wavered. While saying that, he looked across to this side of the House, but I am satisfied that the Prime Minister, in his heart of hearts, felt that the reflection was upon himself and his friends on that side of the House, who have been 'everything by turns and nothing long,' and who have never known where they stood on questions of principle. On March 3, 1896, the right hon. Prime Minister, as reported in 'Hansard' at page 2737-8 addressing the leader of the government of that day said:

The hon. gentleman is aware—more than anybody else, perhaps, he ought to be aware—that in a community with a free government, in a free country like this, upon any question involving different conceptions of what is right or wrong, different standards of what is just or unjust, it is the part of statesmanship not to force the views of any section, but to endeavour to bring them all to a uniform standard and a uniform conception of what is right.

I heartily commend these words to the Prime Minister to-day. What are the facts in regard to this question? The Hudson Bay Territory was taken over by the imperial authorities and transferred by them to the Canadian authorities. I shall not enter into a description of those vast territories and their latent resources, and the great wealth that lies there to be developed. These are all well known to all the members of this House. Those territories were united with the Dominion of Canada, and in that Act of union, although it was known and intended that they were sooner or later to be erected into provinces, there was no mention of separate schools. They were given a constitution by the Dominion parliament, and, inasmuch as the few people living in the territories spoke the French language, the people of Canada allowed them to have their own schools. That, and that alone, was the reason why those schools were given to those people without any serious opposition. My hon. friend from Montmagny is in error in saying that it was thought at that time that those territories were going to become French and Roman Catholic. It was understood that there would be a large French settlement in the province of Manitoba; but with regard to the territories, the understanding from one end of the Dominion to