

If it be true as he said, that we have public schools in Canada, in which no religion is taught and separate schools where the tenets of the Roman Catholic church are taught, and that in the United States they have only public schools wherein no religion is taught; therefore the murders lynchings, and the divorces in the United States must be attributable to the Catholics of the United States, according to his logic. It could not be attributed to the Protestants because the system of education is the same for them in Canada as in the United States and the only possible argument that can be advanced is: Give us separate schools here because the tone of morals will then be so much higher that we will shine in comparison with our less blessed neighbours to the south. This logical conclusion is irresistible, yet the hon. gentlemen opposite showed their approval of this as one of the Prime Minister's strongest arguments. The hon. gentleman spoke of the obligation resting on us to maintain separate schools in the west because they were given by legislation and pointed out that we here had given the Canadian Pacific Railway a certain exemption from taxation and that nobody would think of revoking that Act passed by this parliament. I thought at the time the right hon. gentleman could hardly be speaking seriously. Surely he must admit that there is all the difference in the world between an ordinance passed by a legislature that can give one day and recall the next a solemn bargain between a country and a railway company whereby in consideration of certain things done and promised by the country the company agrees to build a railroad. In one case there is a bargain and in the other there is no bargain. If these were a parallel—I do not think there is an exact one, but if I were looking for one—I would find it in the case of the Land Act of the Northwest Territories, whereby land was set aside for purposes of education and subsequently this House deliberately changed that to reserve the lands for the public schools, and from that day to this thousands and thousands of acres of land have been held in trust for the benefit of public schools. If any settlers went in under any inducement what would be a greater inducement than to come to a land where hundreds and thousands of acres were set aside solemnly by the Dominion parliament for the aid of public schools? And yet the hon. gentleman does not hesitate to break that law and that trust by this Act ruthlessly to lay hands on the public lands and divide the proceeds between the public and the so-called separate schools.

The Minister of Finance gave us an assurance the other night that was certainly very gratifying when he told us there was no legal or binding obligation to re-enact the law of 1875. If there is no legal or binding obligation to re-enact that law, then we on this side of the House cannot be blamed, I

suppose, if we prefer not to enact it. The hon. the Minister of Finance whose intelligence we all admit, whose capacity fully to understand the full effect and grasp of the possibilities of the resolution before the House quite as well as some hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, would come to the discussion of the subject in the House with a breezy freshness which the hon. gentlemen would lack because he did not see the Act as soon as they and so it is fresher in his mind; that hon. gentleman the other night said:

We do not propose to override any Act of any legislature. What we propose to-day is to confirm and continue for all future time a measure which the free voice of the Northwest legislature has placed upon the statute-book of the Territories.

The free voice of the Northwest Territories legislature compelled by this House to have separate schools, being the best they could do by the burdens laid on them. I refer to the remarks of the Minister of Finance perhaps more frequently than those of other gentlemen because I enjoyed them as an oratorical effort. He favoured us with a description of the Paradise Regained in the little province of Nova Scotia; he described the absolute bliss that reigned there among those religious classes which are warring in other portions of the country and pointed to the absolute harmony, concord and progress which prevailed there because they had not any separate school system and in triumph, glorying as he was in this happy state of Nova Scotia, his colleague the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Emmerson), not wishing to be completely eclipsed, called his attention to the fact that a similarly happy condition of affairs prevails in New Brunswick where there are no separate schools. The hon. gentleman held this House spell-bound with an eloquence which we can admire without attempting to imitate, in one of the most glorious oratorical efforts ever given in this House while he proved that inasmuch as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were so perfectly happy and free and prosperous without separate schools, therefore we ought to impose on the Northwest Territories separate schools. Is it any wonder, Sir, when we find an Act introduced into this House under such circumstances as those under which this Act was introduced, to which we have called attention before, and when we find that Act supported by such argument and eloquence as that, is it any wonder—and I ask it in all seriousness—that this class of people who have been referred to as the majority sometimes wonder if there is not more in the Act than is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite? If there is nothing more in the Act than the Minister of Finance said—and far be it from me to transgress the rules of the House or, outside of the House, to doubt his word, if there be nothing more than he said, viz: the paltry half-hour for religious instruction

Mr. NORTHRUP.