

making a total of \$4,271,774.15. This does not include the revenue from fisheries, licenses, companies, succession duties, public institutions, and the revenue from many other sources; so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) was unfair to Ontario in making these comparisons. He told us that when each of these new provinces has a population of 2,000,000 they will receive a revenue from the Dominion of \$2,200,000. But they will not have their own Crown lands, their timber or their minerals, and they will have to resort to direct taxation. Hence it is that I claim that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) tried to create a wrong impression in the west when he made these statements.

In the west we will have three provincial governments, three ministries, three legislatures, three sets of departments, three judicial systems and three provincial subsidies, where two under each department would be plenty. We have too much government in Canada as it is now, and the idea of multiplying unnecessary governments should not be encouraged. However, Mr. Speaker, the Bill was presented for its second reading, and, in the interim the press, the pulpit, and the platforms of this country had been educating public opinion on the question, and the draughtsman of the Bill saw it was best to change the wording of this clause pertaining to education. This change in the education clause has had the desired effect of apparently bringing the party together again, but there has not been a man of them who has succeeded in explaining the difference between the amended and the original clauses.

The Minister of Agriculture and a number of others have been asked to explain to this House the difference between these clauses, but they have not been able even to attempt an explanation of them. Carlyle says: 'Men never for any length of time deliberately rebel against anything that does not deserve rebelling against.' So with the people of Canada. If they did not feel that this Bill was an imposition upon their rights, they would not be rebelling against it as they are doing to-day. They do feel that the government are forcing legislation on those provinces that should not be forced upon them, and that they are perfectly justified in rebelling against that legislation. Some government members have said that the people of Ontario are intolerant on this question. I want to say to these hon. gentlemen that they do not know the people of Ontario when they speak of them as an intolerant people. The people of Ontario are a most tolerant people, a people who have readily and willingly and gladly given to the minority in years gone by practically everything they possess. The ministers from Ontario, Mr. Speaker, are not representing the people of that province on this question. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) came into my riding during the

last election and undertook to tell the people of that part of the country how to vote. If that hon. gentleman would come into that riding to-day, he would find a very different reception from what he did when he last went there. The Acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) also came into my riding. If he were to consult his best interests he will stay at home and attend to that little seventeen which he had better foster and care for or it will be blotted out of existence. What about the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock)? It has been my privilege to live twenty-three years of my life in the county of York, I know the feeling of the people there, and I know that the Postmaster General is not representing the people of his own riding or the people of the province of Ontario in taking the position he does to-day. Had these hon. gentlemen stood true to the principles they avowed in 1896, they would have compelled the right hon. the premier to eliminate the educational clauses from these Bills, and thereby cement the bond between the races; but, instead of that, they are abandoning provincial rights, and they are ready to brand those new provinces with educational clauses that will be a detriment to them for all time to come.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, which deserves our most earnest consideration. I will read it:

All the words after the word 'that' to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill (No. 69), the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy full powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

I believe that this amendment is a just and a fair proposition to offset the proposed legislation of the government, and I am sorry indeed to have heard the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Laurence) make the remark that the leader of the opposition did not display much courage in presenting that amendment. That hon. gentleman was not fair in that criticism, because no man has presented a more able and statesmanlike argument to this House than has the worthy leader of His Majesty's loyal opposition. Our leader's position on this question is like his position on all others, clear and statesmanlike. He stands by the constitution and by provincial rights, and his arguments have not been successfully refuted. He referred to many of the constitutional authorities, men like Blake, Clements, Sir Louis Davies, Christopher Robinson and the Hon. David Mills—all backing up his decis-

Mr. ARMSTRONG.