suppose that all that was changed and that we obtained power to subvert that which Mr. Blake said was not capable of alteration.

The first step as regards education in the Territories was the Dominion Act of 1875, section 11, and it was followed by Territorial ordinances passed in obedience to that Act. Neither the Act of 1875, nor any of the early ordinances—at all events those that it is claimed the minority rely upon—neither the Act nor the ordinances were the result of the will of the people of the Territories. From first to last the people of the Territories had nothing to do with it; they were never consulted. The Act of 1875, was passed by this parliament, and the ordinances were passed by the Lieutenant Governor and two or three gentlemen who formed his executive, all appointees of this government. These gentlemen passed ordinances that, it is contended by some, must apply for all time not only to the Territories, but also to the provinces when created. The Hon. Mr. Dewdney, sitting up there in 1884, with a couple of gentlemen, his executive, wrote out 177 clauses of ordinances in obedience to the dictates of the Ottawa government, and forsooth, the people of these Territories are never to be able to improve or alter their school system. I have read section 4 of the Act of 1871, which enabled us to pass the Act of 1875. The Act of 1875, did not give permission even to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to pass laws as to education; it said: not you 'may' create separate schools, but you 'shall' create separate schools. That was the beginning of it, and because the Dominion appointed officers up there—who probably would have been dismissed if they did not obey—because they passed these ordinances we are now told that the people of the Territories passed them. And to-day, when constituting two provinces it appears we must work such ordinances into their laws, and discreetly alter subclauses of the British North America Act of 1867 so that provincial Acts may be disallowed if they prejudice any privilege in ordinances 29 and 30.

Let me read clause 8 of the Act of 1875 to show the kind of government that was exercised over this territory supposed to be controlled by the free will of a free people. Clause 8 says:

> The Governor General in Council may, by proclamation from time to time, direct that any Act of the parliament of Canada or any part or parts thereof, or any one or more of the sections of any one or more of such Acts, shall be enforced in the Northwest Territories generally or in any part or parts thereof to be mentioned in the proclamation.

That was the same Act of 1875, which dictated the school laws to the Territories, and is it to be supposed that a people governed under such provisions as that were a free people exercising their will upon education or anything else? Surely such a contention is absurd. There is a word or two from Mr. Sifton that I can quote on that subject. On the 24th of March last the hon. gentleman in announcing his conversion to the amendments used these words:

> From my standpoint I say, inasmuch as the Northwest Territories are not a free community, inasmuch as the ordinances passed are ordinances passed under a limited power, therefore when they come into the family of provinces we ought not to apply to them the principle of observing the status quo, because the status quo was not brought about by their own unlimited powers.

With regard to the ex-Minister of the Interior, it will not be forgotten that he resigned his portfolio rather than accept the original Bill. As member for Brandon, three weeks later, he accepted it on the assurance that clause 16 would be struck out and the proposed amendment substituted. Now, I understand his explanation to be that under clause 11 of the Act of 1875—clause 16 of the Bill is in substance the same—Orders in Council were passed giving sectional control of separate schools, Catholics controlling one set and Protestants the other; that these ordinances were amended by later ones, which did away with sectional control; that on one occasion Sir John Thompson, as Minister of Justice, had declared a certain later ordinance ultra vires; and that he, the member for Brandon feared, he would not say actually that it would be so, but apparently he feared that if the amending ordinances were ultra vires, the original ordinances would stand good, and so we would have the old clause of 1875 and the old ordinances giving Catholics control of Catholic schools, thus establishing for all time what he believed, according to his experience in Manitoba, to be a bad system. That I understood to be his argument, an argument based on the ordinances, because there is not a word in the Act of 1875 giving more than a right for Catholics to have a school separate from Protestants, and vice versa. I have just read what he said on that point. Now, I propose to show, first, that by the Act of 1875 no right to religious teaching in the schools was given; second that if clause 16 remain in the Bill, that in itself would have conferred no such right—that it went on further than the clause of 1875; third, that ordinances 29 and 30 are to-day in force, and contain all and more than clause 16; fourth, that under the original Bill ordinances 29 and 30, even as they are, could have been amended by the legislature of the new province. Section 15 of the Bill provided that every ordinance should remain in force until altered by the legislature of the new province; therefore if the Bill had been left as it was first drawn by the Minister of Justice ordinances 29 and 30 would have been subject to repeal or amendment by the new legislature; fifth,