OTTAWA GETS IT, GETS IT BAD MONOPOLY CREATED, 56-80

Quebec Solidly Backs Up Laurier, Tho 22 Liberals Did What They Could for the City.

Ottawa, March 29.—(Special.)—By a majority of 24 the house of commons last night passed the bill giving the Ottawa Electric Company power to absorb the Consumers' and Metropolitan concerns, and creating a monopoly in electric lighting in the City of Ottawa. The vote was taken on Mr. Stewart's amendment to prevent the acquisition of the competing companies, and every member of the opposition present voted for it except four. They were: Bergeron, Monk, Leonard and Morin. In fact, the Quebec members to a man voted solidly with Sir Wilfrid Laurier against the city.

Some 22 Liberal members from the other provinces supported Ottawa's two representatives in their opposition to the bill, and there were several notable absentees on that side of the house when the division was taken. The Liberal whips, of course, together with all the cabinet ministers excepting Sir William Mulock and Mr. Hyman, led the procession in favor of the bill, and the result was a bad turndown for the citizens of Ottawa.

Dr. Sproule and the member for South York were the chief supporters of Mr. Stewart of Ottawa in opposition to the bill.

Mr. Maclean said: "The more we discuss this matter, the more it becomes evident that this bill is a raid on the revenue of the people of Ottawa, and that this parliament ought to refuse to pass it. This parliament has no reason to occupy itself with the domestic affairs of the City of Ottawa, especially in a matter so extremely local. The question never should have come to this house, and the bill is evidently an invasion of the municipal rights of the Province of Ontario. The matter should really be dealt with in the Ontario Legislature. In Toronto this bill is regarded as an invasion of municipal rights.

"We have had produced here the testimony of the two members for Ottawa, representing this city, and a petition signed by a large number of the citizens of Ottawa has been laid on the table, in which the people regard this bill as an invasion of their rights. But, in spite of all that, this house, for some reason or other, proposes to override the rights of the people of Ottawa.

"What we see in this house to-day is a party prepared not only to invade municipal rights, but public and provincial rights, and the people outside are taking observations of these things.

Breaking Faith.

"There was a solemn obligation on the part of this company not to amalgamate. It is seeking power to-day to make an amalgamation, and this object is nothing else than that it may be in a position to increase its charges for electricity to its customers, the citizens of Ottawa and this Dominion. This parliament is setting an example to the legislature of this country to leave out of consideration the rights of the people wherever these rights are opposed to the interests of private corporations. I object to this, as I have objected to it; and I shall vote against it. I believe that when the people realize what this movement on the parts of its corporations means they will put it down.

"Hon. gentlemen opposite make fun of municipal rights and members from Quebec in particular take part in the invasion of municipal rights. But the day is coming, and coming soon, when this parliament will be taken to task for the way it has treated the municipal rights of the people, not only in this province, but all over the country. These companies may lobby this house and make themselves great friends of the people in power, but I say it is a shame that the political debts of honorable gentlemen opposite should be paid at the expense of the municipal rights of the people of this city."

The Division.

The division was taken on Mr. Stewart's amendment to prevent the merger of the electric companies, and it was defeated by 56 to 80. The bill carried on the same division, reversed. The vote on the amendment was as follows:

Yeas—Messrs. Alcorn, Ames, Barr, Belcourt, Bennett, Blain, Bland, Boyce, Brabazon, Burrows, Campbell, Chisholm, Christie, Clarke, Clements, Cockshutt, Daniel, Elson, Foster, Gallery, Gordon, Gunn, Henderson, Herron, Hyman, Ingram, Jackson (Selkirk), Johnston (Lambton), Kemp, Kennedy, Lalor, Laurence, Lennox, Lewis, Loggie, McLaren, Maclean (S. York), McCarthy (Calgary), McIntyre, McKenzie (Bruce), Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.), Martin (Wellington), Miller, Mulock (Sir William), Oliver, Paterson, Ratz, Schaffner, Sproule, Staples, Stewart, Talbot (Stratheona), Thompson, Walsh, Wilson (Lennox and Addington), Zimmerman. Total 80.

Nays—Archambault, Beauparlant, Beland, Bergeron, Bickerdike, Boyer, Brodeur, Brown, Ermeau, Bureau, Caldwell, Calvert, Carney, Carvell, Cash, Copp, Cyr, Delisle, Demers (St. John), Derbyshire, Desjardins, Devlin, Dugas, Fielding, Finley, Finlayson, Fitzpatrick, Fortier, Gallibar, Gauvreau, Geoffrion, Girard, Hall, Harty, Hughes (King's, P.E.I.), Hunt, Johnston (Cape Breton, South), Lachance, Lamont, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Laurier (L'Assomption), Lavergne (Drummond and Arth), Leblanc, Lemieux, Leonard, Logan, Lovell, MacDonald, MacLean (Lunenburg), MacPherson, McCarthy (Simcoe), McColl, McCool, McIsaac, McKenzie (Cape Breton, North), McLennan, Marcil (Bonaventure), Mayrand, Meigs, Monk, Morin, Parmoe, Parent, Piche, Pickup, Reid (Restigouche), Riley, Ross (Rimouski), Ross (Yale-Cariboo), Rousseau, Savoie, Scott, Sinclair, Talbot (Bellechase), Telford, Tobin, Turgeon, Turriff, Wilson (Russell), Wright (Renfrew). Total 80.

GOING TO STIR THEM UP.

But Liberals Threaten to Ignore Anti-Home Rule Resolution.

London, March 29.—In the house of commons to-night Osmond Williams, Liberal, offered a motion declaring that in the opinion of the house grave injury would be caused to the shipping industry and other industries dependent thereupon by the adoption of the fiscal changes proposed by Mr. Chamberlain.

Professor James Bryce (Liberal) declared that it was time these suspensions of ministerial vitality should cease. The only consolation for these grotesque performances was that the government was making itself so ridiculous that it must be nearing its end.

Osmond Williams' motion was adopted without a division.

The opposition will have its innings on April 12, when Mr. Tuff (Unionist) will introduce an anti-home rule resolution, which it is understood will condemn the utterances of both Liberal and Nationalist members on home rule. It is stated to-night that the Liberals will refuse to participate in the debate or in the division on the motion.

45,000 MINERS WILL QUIT WORK.

Operators and Miners in the Penna. District Disagree on Terms.

Altoona, Pa., March 29.—The operators and miners of the Central Bituminous District of Pennsylvania, after being in conference here almost continuously since March 18, endeavoring to agree upon a wage scale to go into effect on April 1, adjourned finally to-day without coming to an agreement. The failure to agree means a suspension of work by the 45,000 organized miners of the district at the end of the present month.

When the joint scale committee met to-day, the operators stood upon their proposition for a 10 per cent. reduction for the first half of the approaching mining year and the present scale, based upon 62 cents for pick mining, for the second half of the year. The miners' ultimatum demanded a renewal of the present scale for the full year.

Nordheimer
—Pianos—
ARE THE HIGHEST GRADE
INSTRUMENTS MADE IN CANADA.

FOSTER TURNS NO CORNER

Continued From Page 1.

united government after full consideration or the thoughts and feelings of the territories.

Then Trouble Arose.

Then some trouble arose, a disruption took place and a minister resigned because he had not been consulted in regard to the educational clause, that he dissented from it and could not any longer remain in the government for that reason. Explanations followed, and it was found that another important member of the government had not been consulted upon the measure, having been absent from the country. Why this haste, Mr. Foster asked, to bring in a bill to one of the most important clauses of which two ministers were strongly opposed? Then it came out that the Northwest members, who, if they had been consulted about the clause, must have forgotten its import, upon Mr. Sifton's return discovered they could not support it and went not into open but secret revolt.

Mr. Foster pointed out that the premier of the Northwest had not been consulted, but that the educational clauses were only mentioned casually to him on the Friday, and a portion of a sub-committee was sent to consult with Mr. Haultain just three hours before the bill was introduced. For what reason did the prime minister not consult openly and frankly with the representatives of the half million people primarily interested in the measure? Yet Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who had always been loud in his insistence upon the rights and duties of proyinces in these compacts which were merged into a constitution, treated them cavalierly in this matter.

One Excuse Given.

One excuse given by a member of the government was that Mr. Haultain, the premier, only expressed his personal views, while Mr. Bulyea, his colleague, agreed with the school clauses of the bill. The premier did not count. It was the tail that swung the body, according to Mr. Fielding. The wonder was, then, why the tail of the cabinet, in the shape of the late minister of interior, did not swing the government.

"If," said Mr. Foster, "Mr. Bulyea has signified his assent to this clause, and we are not satisfied that he has, it seems that his premier is still left to be consulted with. Has the minister had frequent consultation with Mr. Bulyea in Mr. Haultain's absence? Did Liberal members from the Northwest colloque with Mr. Bulyea and the prime minister unknown to Mr. Haultain and without any invitation to Mr. Haultain to be present?"

But something more dramatic still had occurred. Mr. Sifton announced his resignation because the bill had been prepared in his absence and the educational clauses were against his principles.

"And after three weeks of fighting within and rumors without, and multitudinous midnight parleys and countless journeys by noon-day, Mr. Sifton came down and said he had at last been able to put the ring into the nose of the government and bring it to its knees."

Very Strange Indeed.

Mr. Foster dealt with the premier's statement, to the effect that it was never intended to put in the constitution of the new provinces any privileges which the minority didn't already enjoy under the Northwest ordinances. A similar statement had been made by the minister of justice. These were strange statements, in view of the fact that Mr. Sifton resigned because he thought the minority was given more than it now enjoys. Why had not the premier frankly told Mr. Sifton that it was not his purpose to go further than the Northwest ordinances, in which case the resignation could have been avoided?

"Was it on the card that the minister of interior should resign?" asked Mr. Foster. "And was this misunderstanding allowed to continue in order to give him a chance to resign? For what happens at the end of three weeks' time? The clause is brought down exactly to the liking of the former minister of the interior. If the prime minister did not wish to get rid of his minister of the interior, why did he not agree with him before the breaking out took place? Can there be any explanation of that mystery?"

Mr. Foster said one reason why Mr. Sifton would not accept clause 16 was that in the verbiage compact, well thought out, put together by the hand of a master, there was something concealed.

"There was an irrevocable constitutional ear-mark upon public funds of this country, devoting them forever to a separate school minority in those territories, an ear-mark which makes one of the grandest sectarian endowments in the whole history of the world.

Who Were Chloroformed?

"It would be a pity," said Mr. Foster, "if we could not take the minister of the interior at his own valuation. But we have endorsements, for when the minister of the interior made the statement, his former leader and the minister of justice assented by utter silence and the postmaster-general applauded to the echo, as did also the minister of customs and the minister of finance. Now the further question that arises is this: What soporific drug had been administered to the postmaster-general, that lynx-eyed man of business and reader of constitutional law, what strange mixture had been administered to the minister of finance, generally clear-headed and long-sighted, and to our incomparable minister of customs; what had been administered to put them into a sleep of months whilst that aptly worked, finely phrased clause concealed within its innocent outside the foundation and formation of an irrevocable constitutional ear-marked sectarian endowment, than which there has been none greater in the history of this country?"

(Hear, hear.)

Sir William's Position.

The postmaster-general was a member of the sub-committee that framed the bill. Either he did not know what was in that clause and consequently he is unworthy of his position or he did know it and he assented to it, and if it had not been for the superior nerve of the minister of the interior the country would have been no wiser until this day; that clause might have gone thru and the postmaster-general would have to father the responsibility for it.

"Has the postmaster-general any excuse to offer? Mr. Foster said he noticed that when the ex-minister of the interior was flourishing the lash, lead-loaded, and bringing it down on the backs of certain of his colleagues, and when he mentioned casually the existence of a draughtsman, it seemed that with something of a manly glee he watched the effect of the tip of the lash on the back of the minister of justice. The minister of justice would not, of course, shelter himself behind the back of a draughtsman. He will take the responsibility for the clause in question, and it was up to him to explain why, surreptitiously, he got ahead of the minister of customs, of the lynx-eyed postmaster-general, ahead of his own premier, and concealed in that verbiage the potency and power of a most wonderful and remarkably enduring instrument.

Another draughtsman had to be employed to take out the concealed virus that was in section 16, No. 1, and substitute for it the plain and easily read verbiage of section 16, No. 2.

Another Act Suggested.

To-morrow, Mr. Foster suggested, the former minister of the interior might perform another dramatic act and reseat himself on the government benches. What inducement, he asked, had brought back the former minister of the interior and joined him again to his colleagues, his leader and his party, not in the advocacy but in the support of the measure before the house? On the one side were his principles and his records, his reputation before the country as an adherent of principle. What was on the other side, in order to induce him to come back again and put himself in support with his leader and his party on a question to the principle of which he still declares he is opposed?

Mr. Foster dealt with the conduct of the western Liberals most effectively. They were like lost sheep, while the shepherd was away browsing peacefully and pastorally in the far-off western hills, the sheep fell into an artful design; they grouned in the pit and tumbled about until their leader came back and gently led them by paths in the wilderness back to firmer and higher ground.

"But forever and forever," said Mr. Foster, "say what you may or think what you may, the seven members from the territories who were conferred with, who gave their advice to formulate the bill, who knew what was in it, have to bear the onus, either of an ignorance of what was in the bill or an indifference as to what was in it, or of complicity in what the ex-minister of the interior declared was the purpose of the bill."

Mr. Foster strongly condemned the prime minister for not making known to the territories before the last elections the kind of autonomy he proposed to give them. By a trick he had got back absolutely unpledged and without a mandate on this subject. If, said Mr. Foster, the minister of the interior had stood for principle, as he called it, not a single Northwest member would have dared vote for it, and if the west had stood out for it the government would not have dared to put the bill thru.

Bourassa's Argument.

In mildly sarcastic terms Mr. Foster referred to that wild and erudite and tactful pleader for toleration and national unity, Mr. Bourassa, who when he came to the decision of a constitutional question in the 20th century, offered a very fine and learned discourse as to the wonderful, enduring and preservative power of the church in the far gone centuries in reference to keeping the light of knowledge and science burning.

"We live in the 20th century," said Mr. Foster; "we cannot now decide the question of a common school system, on what were the excellencies of the repositories of learning two or three or four centuries ago; we have to take the conditions as they are to-day and by weighing these conditions come to our best conclusion."

Mr. Foster said he had noticed Mr. Bourassa chock full of religious fervor and enthusiasm—a fervor and enthusiasm that did him infinite secret satisfaction at the culmination of his argument that it was impossible for Catholics to thoroly enjoy their religion unless they have complete control of their education. He quarreled with no man's religion. There was one circle that enveloped every man that is sacred for himself, and it is the circle in which his God and his conscience meet and in that circle no one had a right to intrude.

"But this is what I mean," said Mr. Foster. "If these were the opinions of the member for Labelle, and undoubtedly they were, what does he want in these provinces? What else can he want but a thing that will do him good from this point of view, a thing that is absolutely essential, if he not going to have a mere sham? The half-hour privilege at the end of the school day is to put a priest in the schoolroom to teach the dogmas of the church. Will that satisfy him?"

Had a Chance Before.

Mr. Foster suggested that if Mr. Bourassa had wanted an opportunity to prevent the robbery of the rights of a minority it was presented to him in 1896. He discussed the premier's attitude on that historic question and showed that the latter in his speech the other day evaded the chief warrant for remedial legislation, which was the fact that Manitoba upon becoming a province enacted a separate school act and in 1890 repealed it. Mr. Foster said he had never served in separate schools as against national schools, but in 1896 he followed his honest beliefs, not what he deemed to be expedient. If on that issue Sir Wilfrid Laurier had thrown his forces with the forces that made for remedial legislation it would have carried in this country. It was not carried, for, as the minister of the interior said, the prime minister threw himself in the way.

Between Two Charmers.

Mr. Foster wanted to know why Mr. Bourassa had not taxed Sir Wilfrid with having helped to rob Manitoba in 1896 of the separate school rights he affected to cherish so highly. What, he would ask, did the present Northwest bill provide? According to the testimony of Archbishop Tache and Judge Roleau, "Nothing now distinguished the Catholic schools from the Protestant schools but the name." Why didn't Mr. Bourassa protest when the "malign influence" of Mr. Sifton was at work tearing out the original clause 16 of the bill and inserting the clause which, it was held, gave only the schools thus described?

"Must we again and again," said Mr. Foster, "come to the same conclusion that both Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Sifton are strong in the enunciation of their principles, but both very lax in carrying them out? On principle the latter is with Mr. Borden, but when it comes to the vote he is with Sir Wilfrid. Such is the cynical and outspoken declaration of the ex-minister of the interior." (Hear, hear.)

Reverting to the case of Manitoba Mr. Foster said Mr. Sifton had charged the bill with endeavoring to impose on Manitoba a useless, insufficient and inexpensive system of education. Mr. Foster denied this. All that was proposed was to embody with remedial legislation guarantees of an efficient school system. Moreover, Mr. Sifton had declared he offered Sir Charles Tupper's government in 1896 the same compromise which Sir Wilfrid Laurier had accepted after the Tories had refused it. Immediately after the "settlement" Sir Wilfrid said in Montreal: "Yet, if we have accepted from the provincial government of Manitoba much more than the commissioners of the late government asked for last spring, we are now to be denounced, one the less, in the name of religion as traitors to our race and religion."

Who was telling the truth, Mr. Sifton or Sir Wilfrid? Another thing, Sir Wilfrid had declared that we were bound by the constitution to give to the Northwest the separate school system we had in Ontario and Quebec, and a great deal had been said about the toleration of Quebec towards the Protestant minority. Why should they not be tolerant? Were the minority not their fellow-citizens, contributing to their finances, building up the country?

Reasons Why.

Mr. Foster continued: "But will Mr. Bourassa allow me to cite things to show why he should be a little more self-contained when he makes the plea of extraordinary toleration for those of his own faith and race? Here is a Protestant child in Quebec. He goes one morning to what is called the public school, the national school. Am I wrong in saying that from the hour he enters the school at 9 o'clock in the morning until he leaves at 4 o'clock in the afternoon he is under the direct, constant, inculcatory spirit of the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church? I'm not misstating the facts, for Mr. Bourassa has declared his belief that 'we cannot properly exercise our religion unless we have the right to teach our children our religion as and when we please.'

"So in all reason, does it not come to this: that your schools are not national schools, that they are Roman Catholic schools? The influence of the church, in the books, in the teaching and in the adornments, is there from 9 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon. And the Protestant child has no other school to go to unless you make provision for him. Is it extraordinary toleration that, having no national schools, no schools that are undogmatic, you are bound to make provision for the Protestant—who is just as honest in wishing well for his creed and in carrying out his religious belief as is the Catholic—and to give him a place where he will not be constantly under the persuasive, the watchful power and teaching of the church. When you talk of toleration I want you to think of that.

Case of Ontario.

"And now take the Province of Ontario. Here is a Catholic child. He goes to the public school, and from the time he enters the school at 9 o'clock until he goes out at 4, there is not a vestige of clerical teaching or influence. The Catholic child comes from the bosom of a Catholic family and returns to the bosom of that family at night, absolutely unassociated and unattacked by any dogma, denominational or clerical, which is against his religious belief or training. That is to say, in Ontario there are national schools."

Mr. Bourassa arose and observed that it was as unjust to compel a Catholic child to go to a non-sectarian school as it is to compel a Protestant child to go to a Catholic school.

Mr. Foster did not dissent from the hon. member's statement of the Catholic position, but he would ask, was it as unjust to have a Catholic child forced, by necessity or environment, to go to a national school in the Province of Ontario, where he is not perverted, as it would be if these national schools taught Methodism or Presbyterianism from morning till night, and perverted the child?

No Compulsion.

Returning to the compact of confederation, Mr. Foster pointed out that in the list of things put exclusively under control of the Dominion parliament, there was nothing which had the remotest relation to education. The dominant idea was that education was a local concern. That was the essential thing. The incidental thing was that there were separate schools in Ontario and Quebec, and the rider was, by agreement, put in to continue that compromise, with a subsequent provision for appeal to the sovereign power in case of a grievance being done the minority. That saving clause was generalized, was extended to the other provinces of the confederation. But that compact did not compel Sir Wilfrid Laurier to embalm the principle of separate schools in the constitution of the new provinces of the Northwest.

Another point in connection with Manitoba was that a chance was never given there for municipal legislation in 1896, and if Mr. Bourassa complained that the Manitoba minority is suffering from an injustice to-day, he had his own leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to blame, for it was he who prevented the passage of the remedial bill. Mr. Foster did not regret a single jot or tittle of his course in 1896. Under similar circumstances, he said, he would do the same thing; but he did not say he would do the same thing again under circumstances which might arise after this, and why? Because there was a power which, after all, was mightier than the constitution, viz., the popular will.

People's Will Supreme.

Mr. Sifton, the Liberal leader, had prevented the Conservatives from giving full force to the constitution in the clear case of 1896. He went to the people that year, and again in 1899 and 1900, and the people declared they did not want remedial legislation. "In the interest of the 41 per cent. of the population which has been spoken of in this house," said Mr. Foster, "in the interests of the Province of Quebec, which was specially interested, we, on this side, tried to get for the minority their rights in the only way we possibly could under the constitution. We were prevented from doing it by the Liberal party, and during three successive elections the Liberal party have endorsed the policy that we want no hands laid on any province, even tho it deprives the minority of that province of the rights guaranteed it under the constitution. AND I MAKE BOLD TO SAY THAT AS LONG AS GRASS GROWS AND WATER RUNS, I DO NOT FEEL DISPOSED TO GO AGAINST THAT WILL, THREE TIMES EXPRESSED, OF THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY. AYE, MR. SPEAKER, THREE TIMES EXPRESSED, AND EXPRESSED IN ITS MAXIMUM, WHERE? AMONG THAT VERY 41 PER CENT. WE HEAR SO MUCH ABOUT.

"And, to any man who says that this agitation is on to-day simply because we are opposed to a French premier, to the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) I have no answer to make. A simple statement of the case is quite sufficient. As to Mr. Oliver's further suggestion that this is a political agitation, whatever might be said about what took place in 1896, he (Mr. Foster) and the Conservative government approached that question against the wishes of many of their best friends. "Not because we thought we had a 'political cinch in prospect,'" added Mr. Foster, "but knowing that in all probability we were going down to our political death, we did it as a constitutional obligation." (Cheers.)

Everything Sacrificed.

Mr. Foster severely criticized Mr. Sifton's position that he was sorry subsection 1 of the educational clause was in the bill because it was an interference with provincial rights, but he would vote for it because it would supply the money to make that interference effective. It was like voting for the means that would scatter the hated plague far and wide. Mr. Sifton was the man who cried in 1896 for unshackled limbs in the provinces; to-day he voted to make the shackling of the Northwest irrevocable. His only excuse was, well, that the King's government must go on. That, too, was Mr. Fielding's excuse. "Don't they mean in their hearts," exclaimed Mr. Foster, "that the Liberal government must go on and that principle, consistency, constitution and everything else must be sacrificed to that end?"

Forty-one per cent. of the people of this country, the finance minister said, bid us put this separate school clause into the constitution. Forty-one per cent. of the country in 1896 seemed to be up in arms against remedial legislation in the Province of Manitoba. But they don't count in the end. What right had Mr. Fielding to say that 41 per cent. of the people demanded it. Only his own unaided word. But did Mr. Fielding pay a high compliment to that 41 per cent. of law-abiding, intelligent, educated, patriotic Catholics of Canada when he said that? When the point comes up and has been fought out in the high courts of parliament and the majority is against them, they will make government in this country impossible. No patriotic, intelligent Catholic said that, and what an example of generosity did Mr. Fielding give when, after declaring, 'Let this constitution go, let us be tolerant,' he then turned round and said all that was given was the half hour after school for religious instruction. He did blame Mr. Bourassa for putting a spoke in Mr. Fielding's wheel by telling him they were tolerant to Catholics in Nova Scotia because of their numerical strength there.

Mr. Foster made a strong plea for leaving the educational matter to the sense of justice and toleration of the people of the Northwest and asked his opponents to look at the strength of the sentiment in favor of a national school system.

Mr. Bourassa interrupted with the remark that this was the American system.

Mr. Foster replied that it was also the Canadian system—the system of non-sectarian education, where all were treated alike, the children meeting together in their studies and in their sports, with a common interest in the affairs of their country, letting manners, morals and the basis of religious conduct be taught in the schools, but letting each class get its dogmatic instruction where it pleased.

Mr. Foster went on to say that the principle of national schools was this, that if the Presbyterians or any other body, including the Catholics, were to say we want religious teaching in the schools, the answer would be, teach religion in your churches and Sunday schools. Where would be the tyranny in that?

Mr. Bourassa interrupted to say that in the Manitoba case of Bennett v. the Queen it was held that such a system was a glaring injustice, and it was that injustice that Mr. Foster had been in favor of removing by remedial legislation.

Mr. Foster replied that that was not the case at all. The grievance consisted in the prejudicial effect of Manitoba taking away what she had given of her own free will. A vastly different thing.

Mr. Bourassa said his interruption was not to discuss the legal aspect of the case but to refute the argument that a system of national schools ought to be satisfactory to Catholics.

Continuing, Mr. Foster asked why an attempt should be made to interject into the constitution of the new provinces a system of separate schools, without authority from them and against the disposition and feelings of the people? If the other five provinces of the Dominion could be trusted, why should the new province be forever tagged with a badge of inferiority? Was it not a retrograde step to stand on our small platform of 1905, hold up a statute of limitations forever in the face of two provinces, in which as the centuries roll by changes must inevitably come; systems come, systems go; new methods take the place of old. It was at least unwise to arrange and impossible of successful accomplishment.

His Eloquent Periods.

"The right hon. gentlemen," said Mr. Foster, "may tag on his badge of bondage; he may utter his irrevocable decree to perpetuate it, but I tell him that against the free thought and free will of these two provinces with their millions of people, his statute of limitations will be as waste-paper, and his chains of bondage will be severed. There is no hand that can fashion the clay that drive the rivet that will encompass and restrict the young giants of the Northwest in the years to come. You may carry your project thru, and the finance minister may cry peace, peace, but the moment it is carried thru and made irrevocable begins against it the warfare of an unwilling people."

"More illogical still," Mr. Foster continued, "the member for Labelle said he would trust the people who are there now, trust Mr. Oliver, who voted over and over again for resolutions to destroy the rights of the minority in the Northwest; trust Mr. Sifton, who has abandoned his principles for the sake of party success; you can trust these, but you cannot trust the coming people 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 member for Labelle." (Hear! Hear!)

Mr. Bourassa interrupted that what he had said was that he could not trust the present rulers of the Northwest.

Mr. Foster continued that M. Bourassa had urged separate schools for the Northwest so that French-Canadians would flock into the country. But what had he to say of the hundreds of thousands of the choice youths of Quebec, who had flocked into the United States with its godless schools and absence of rights for the minority and for the French language? But would the restriction, if put upon the Northwest, in principle unjust, and in practice irksome, be worth the paper it was written upon? It was not the school regulations, but merely the ordinances that were put into the new constitution, and the ordinance with reference to the separate schools is absolutely the same as the provision of the law of 1875. If the schools were not the same as 20 years ago, it was because of the regulations, so that the ordinances might be put into the constitution, but, the people of the Northwest being opposed to going back to the old form, they would make regulations as they pleased, and nobody could stop them.

Beside the Question.

"All this discussion, Mr. Speaker, seems out of place in this house," Mr. Foster said, in conclusion. "To discuss the school systems of the United States, of Spain, of Germany, of France, of these provinces, to try to settle which has most merit in all its principles and details, is something which is absolutely foreign to this house, and never should be brought here. It has no place here legitimately. As I said before, the plea may be good, but you are in the wrong court. To the provinces you should go for these tolerant privileges, these rights which they may give you by law. The province alone can do it, and in the long run, what the ex-minister of the interior said the other day is this: "I am still strongly of opinion that it is best for the Catholic minority that they should trust to the legislature of the Northwest, and that in the end they will be better off thereby. If that is done, we can bid farewell to these discussions in this house, where different races and creeds are represented, and where the passions which, good or bad, whatever you may call them, are always aroused when you come to questions of religious belief and dogma, will no longer intervene to distract and paralyze the business of this country. Let these questions be brought out in the provinces; that is the ultimate tribunal; and again I plead for absolute unrestricted freedom and belief in the tolerance of the Northwest people, now and in the future, for fair treatment to all their fellow-citizens." (Cheers.)

Mulock Speaks in Defence.

Sir William Mulock had been glaring at Mr. Foster all thru the latter's speech. When, at 9 o'clock to-night, private bills were disposed of, Sir William took up the debate and by way of preliminary amenities accused Mr. Foster of trying to sow the seeds of discord, to the great injury of his country. It must be extremely elevating, he said sarcastically, for Canada to take its ideas of political morality from such a source. Sir William searched Mr. Foster's political record, dwelling on what he termed the latter's treachery to Sir Mackenzie Bowell and his conduct generally in the crisis of 1896. Mr. Foster had tried to create the impression that Quebec was being given a stone instead of bread. His object was to envelop the whole Dominion in one huge religious conflagration.

Sir William said he had too high an opinion of the people of Toronto to suppose that they wanted their member to be a political incendiary. Speaking of Mr. Sifton, he said: "Of all the members who have held portfolios since confederation, none has rendered such valuable service to Canada as the ex-minister of the interior, and his withdrawal from our cabinet is a national loss."

Disagrees Here.

Sir William said he did not agree with Mr. Sifton's interpretation of the separate school clauses as originally drafted.

Sir William devoted some time to an analysis of the constitutional aspect of the situation. The spirit of the constitution, he said, was to provide different arrangements to meet local conditions. The B.N.A. Act must be applied to the present as well as to the dead past. The new provinces would have no rights till parliament declared their rights. It was for parliament to say what these rights should be.

In the case of the other provinces, education was left as it was at the time they entered confederation. Why should a different rule be adopted in regard to the new provinces? Sir William denounced with some warmth Dr. Sproule's "efforts to stir up Ontario Protestants," and the efforts of the Jacques Cartier Club and the Conservative newspapers to stir up Quebec on the other side. The school question, he declared, was being settled on a fair basis, instead of being allowed to remain open and stop Canada's progress.

Had Wasted Time.

A. E. Lancaster replied with a vigorous speech. He said the postmaster-general had wasted the time of the house abusing Mr. Foster and Dr. Sproule. No passionate speeches had been delivered from the Conservative side. It was the minister of justice who had asserted that there would be trouble unless 40 per cent. of the people got what they wanted, regardless of the constitution. The new provinces, Mr. Lancaster declared, should be left to deal with the school question as they thought fit.

Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville) moved the adjournment of the debate.

REV. GEO. E. H. JONES, B.A.
Of Glasgow, Scotland, New Pastor of St. Giles' Presbyterian Church.

GETTING OFF TO GOOD START.

(Canadian Associated Press Cable.)

London, March 29.—Four hundred of Dr. Barnardo's boys leave London today for Liverpool, en route for Canada. Before leaving, they will be addressed by Dr. Torrey and Mr. Alexander, the United States revivalists.

57 Varieties for Hespeler.

Hespeler, March 29.—(Special.)—H. H. Cowan and A. O. Pattengell, representing the H. J. Heinz Company, are in town for the purpose of locating a pickling station for the Heinz Company here if sufficient acreage for growing supplies can be contracted for with the farmers of the neighborhood. A meeting of citizens was held in the council chamber, when a resolution was passed endorsing the enterprise. The Merchants' Association of the town will probably assist the company's representatives in their canvass.

G. Company's Theatre Party.

G Company of the 48th Highlanders held their annual theatre party last night. After the performance they went to McConkey's for supper. About 100 were present, who thoroly enjoyed an exceedingly pleasant evening.

"Not the best Whisky in the world, but one of them."

CUNNINGHAM & STRAIN
Sole Agents for Canada,
Board of Trade Bldg., Montreal.

GOURLAY, WINTER & LEEMING
PIANOS
IN THE
BARGAIN ROOM

Not quite new, but what of that! Each is in first-class order and may be relied upon to give good service. Our experts have provided for that, and the broadest kind of guarantee protects you. If at any time one fails to please, all you have to do is to say so—and select another.

	Manufacturers' price	Bargain price
NORDHEIMER (Square). Handsome Square Piano in rosewood case, with curved legs and lyre. In good order. 7 octaves, overstrung scale, etc.	$350	$99
HEINTZMAN & CO. (Square). Fine 7 1-3 octave, overstrung Square Piano, in handsome case, rosewood finish. If it were an upright it would sell for a good deal more.	$450	$119
WILLIAMS (Upright Grand). 7½ octave large Upright Piano, by R. S. Williams. Not exactly a new style case, but the better value because of that.	$400	$178
GERHARD HEINTZMAN (Upright). 7 1-3 octave Upright Gerhard Heintzman Piano, with full length music desk, panels carved in relief, three unisons, ivory and ebony keys, etc.	$375	$241
GERHARD HEINTZMAN (Upright). Extra handsome large Cabinet Grand Gerhard Heintzman Piano. This piano we received new from the factory last September, and contains every patent contained in any piano of this make.	$500	$315
KNABE (Upright). A handsome walnut finish Knabe Piano, cabinet grand size, that we have used for concerts, and now, after having been renewed and readjusted, we offer for little more than half the original price.	$675	$365

Every Piano is Guaranteed for Five Years, with Five Years' Option of Exchange.

We guarantee every piano on the list for five years, the same as a new piano, and agree to accept the return of any instrument within five years in exchange for a new Gourlay Piano, said Gourlay Piano to be supplied at the then current net cash price, and the instrument so exchanged to be taken back at the full price paid, less just $10 per year for wear and depreciation.

Terms of Payment
Pianos under $150—$10 cash and $4 per month.
Pianos under $250—$10 cash and $6 per month.
Pianos over $250—$15 cash and $7 per month.

GOURLAY, WINTER & LEEMING
188 Yonge Street TORONTO.
Hamilton—66 King St. West.

WESTERN ONTARIO GOOD ROADS ASSOCIATION

Annual meeting in the county council chamber, Adelaide-street, Toronto, on Wednesday, April 12, at 2 p.m.

Important papers on subjects connected with good roads will be read and discussed, including the proposed application to the government to amend section 606 of the Municipal Act, as suggested by the Elgin Municipal Association, in respect of which and other municipal amendments a provincial deputation will wait upon the government on April 13, at 11 a.m.

Representatives from county and other municipal councils and all persons interested in the improvement of public highways are invited to attend and take part in the proceedings.

Reduced fares in proportion to the attendance will be granted to all attending the convention who purchase one full-fare, first-class ticket to Toronto, and at the same time apply for and obtain a standard railway certificate for attendance at the convention.

No reduction of fare can be made unless the certificate is applied for and obtained at the point of departure.

J. E. FAREWELL,
Whitby, March 25, '05. Secretary.

GRAND TRUNK TRAINS LATE.

Mishap Delays One and Many Immigrants the Other.

The difficulty in coping with the unprecedented tide of immigration flowing into Montreal was given by local officials as the reason for the delay to the Grand Trunk express due here at 4.30 p.m., which did not arrive until two hours later. They claimed that traffic was disarranged by the extra accommodation which had to be provided for the newcomers.

For a different reason the G. T. R. Montreal train due at 9.30 last night also did violence to schedule to the extent of two hours. This time the trouble was in the form of a broken engine wheel, the mishap taking place near Grafton, between Colborne and Cobourg.

"The largest number of women and children I have yet seen in an immigration party," was the remark made by Government Immigration Agent Persse in reference to the belated contingent brought in last night. The batch was one of 100, and of the number only about one-half were men. A number of the children were very young and carried in arms. All were fairly well dressed and looked contented and happy. Attached to the train was a private car containing Vice-President A. G. Yates of the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg line and a party of five from Buffalo and Rochester, who had been attending the Beith sale of horses at Bowmanville.

CANADA TAKES A JAP LOAN.

Bank of Montreal Reports Satisfactory Business — Subscription Closes To-Day.

Montreal, March 29.—(Special.)—The Japanese loan was received to-day with the greatest favor in financial circles, and altho the amount subscribed will not be given out by the Bank of Montreal, it is known that Montrealers were heavy bidders, consequently, the lists will be closed to-morrow afternoon at 3 o'clock. The following statement was given out this evening by the Bank of Montreal:

"The success of the Japanese loan in London has been repeated in New York, where the official lists are open, to judge from the following telegram received by the Bank of Montreal:

"Are simply overwhelmed with subscriptions, and shall, therefore, close subscription list positively at 3 o'clock to-morrow (Thursday) afternoon. Please do likewise."

It was not generally known that the loan would be offered for subscription in this city until the advertisement appeared in this morning's papers, notwithstanding which, the interest shown by local investors has been most gratifying, and the offering here has been very successful.

No signs of exuberant, impetuous grasping, but a satisfactory demand, was reported concerning local subscriptions yesterday.

CASTORIA
For Infants and Children.
The Kind You Have Always Bought
Bears the Signature of Chas. H. Fletcher