

by the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, in whom hon. gentlemen opposite must have some confidence. As for the Liberals, we say whatever the faults of Sir John Macdonald may have been, and we thought they were neither few nor small, at all events we say there was one thing that could not be charged against him, and that was anything savouring of bigotry or intolerance. He was a broadminded man, he recognized the claims of minorities as well as of majorities, he was built upon broad lines; and his whole political career shows that had he been leader of the opposition at the present time, he would not have introduced an amendment such as has been offered by the present leader of the opposition, the discussion of which savours so much of bigotry and intolerance. We also find that the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir Charles Tupper support clause 11 introducing separate schools. The Hon. David Mills was in the House at that time, the present leader of the Conservative party in the Senate, the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, was also in the House at that time, and both supported the introduction of separate schools in the Northwest Territories. We must also remember, Mr. Speaker, the idea with which they were introduced. It was understood by everybody that this law providing for separate schools was not one which might be repealed the next day, or the next session, or at any future time. Local self-government was to be extended to the Territories, but with a larger and a wider significance, it provided for the future government of the Northwest Territories. The Hon. Edward Blake said on that occasion:

He believed that it was essential to our obtaining a large immigration to the Northwest that we should tell the people beforehand what those rights were to be in the country in which we invited them to settle.

Surely when an Act of that kind was passed, creating separate schools in the Northwest Territories, and when language of that kind was used in the House, the people who have gone into the Northwest Territories relying upon that Act and upon those expressions of opinion, had every reason to expect that the system of separate schools was to be permanent. Then take the language of the Hon. George Brown, of whose opposition to separate schools we have heard so much, and against which he had fought all his life. Speaking upon the Bill to introduce separate schools, he said:

The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

I do not quote Mr. Brown's opinion in that regard as a constitutional authority, but I quote him for the purpose of showing that he recognized that once this clause was enacted into legislation the government were under a moral obligation to see that separate schools were introduced into the North-

Mr. HALL.

west Territories and maintained. Now, when that Act was passed there was a population of about 500 souls in those Territories. To-day they contain a population in the neighbourhood of 500,000. Now, Mr. Speaker, are we to disregard entirely the rights of those people, our Catholic brethren, who have gone in there with the belief that separate schools were a part of the institutions of that country? These men have gone in there and taken up homesteads, and have dragged out their lonely lives for three or four years in order to get a title to their lands; they have erected buildings, they found separate schools in certain districts; and are we now to say that the honour and faith of this parliament are not to be relied upon? Are we to say that the justice which proceeds from the representatives of the people in this House is not pure and clean, but is liable to be polluted and violated by a subsequent parliament? So far as I am concerned, I will be no party to any attempt to deprive a single subject of His Majesty of any right to which he is entitled. I say, therefore, that, under the circumstances, having regard to the way in which this clause 11 was introduced, this parliament is bound in honour to see that separate schools are provided for in the Bill now under consideration, and that we shall not delegate our constitutional powers to a body which will be in a position to undo this legislation passed many years ago, in which the honour of this country is involved, and upon which there is so much at stake.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE CANADA ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 46) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

Mr. D. HENDERSON. Before this motion is disposed of I desire to ask the promoter of the Bill if he cannot inform the House whether the government has any further policy in respect to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway than what has been given to the House. I can scarcely see the propriety of extending this road from Montreal to Georgian bay without making some connection beyond Parry Sound in order to gather up freight. I would like to understand if the government have any fixed policy on that question or if it is their intention to construct a road from Parry Sound, say to Sudbury, and then acquire running rights over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Winnipeg with the view to getting into the wheat fields of the west at a very early date. I think it is very important before we give our assent to the Bill