

of this character, the speakers on the other side of the House who followed the hon. leader of the opposition, seemed to base their argument upon the idea of compromise and policy. I would like for a moment to consider whether there has been any compromise; and the best way to see whether there has been or not is to examine the sections of the Bill under discussion. Section 16 of the Bill as originally presented read as follows:

The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

If section 93 is applied to one of the new provinces as if it were a sovereign province which had come into the union on the 1st of July, 1905, it is beyond question that subsection 1 of that section would apply to it, that subsection being as follows:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

What follows? It is quite plain that the laws that are given effect to by that subsection are the ordinances of 1901, chapters 29, 30 and 31, because these are precisely the laws relating to denominational schools which will be in existence in the new provinces on the 1st July, 1905. When I examine the amended clause, what do I find? I find that that which is supposed to be a compromise reads as follows:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapter 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901.

Precisely the same as the other in every particular. But there is another clause of section 16, subsection 2, which the hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) emphasized as introducing the law in relation to separate schools contained in the Act of 1875. If anybody should be acquainted with the provisions of the school law of the west, it is the hon. the ex-Minister of the Interior. But there is another authority whom we have had the good fortune of hearing on this subject, although the right hon. the Prime Minister apparently considered him a man of no importance when this matter was under discussion; that is, the hon. the premier of the Territories; and he has been good enough to give us some light on this question. He has pointed out that section 41 of chapter 29 of the ordinances of 1901, which is now being brought into force, is a provision creating separate schools in the

same words as those of subsection 2 of section 16 of this Bill. So, Sir, the introduction of this additional section was like putting up a straw man to knock him down, and then taking him out and saying, look what we have done; because that statutory provision is not a mere regulation order in council which can be repealed, but is a statute law conferring the same right which the ex-Minister of the Interior said was conferred by the Act of 1875.

But that is not all. The third and final subsection of this much criticised section 16 provides as follows:

In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equable shares or proportion.

What does the new section say:

In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29 or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or in substitution thereof, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in the said chapter 29.

What are the schools described in the clauses of chapter 29 of the Northwest ordinances? Why, they are the separate schools provided by section 41 of the statute of 1875 which I have just read. And if I understand the question at all, I venture to say that there is no difference in principle or substance between the amended clauses now presented and the clause originally introduced. What then becomes of this extraordinary much vaunted compromise? But let us assume that what is now provided is the law as it is at present in the Northwest Territories. I would like to ask if anybody in this House is able to say what that law is. We are told that if this Bill be passed, everything will be lovely, there will be no litigation, and everybody will be happy. Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that the amended section 16 is a great compromise and practically introduces and makes permanent national schools in the new provinces—separate schools existing in name only—and in view of the contrary statement which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has made, namely, that there is no difference in substance or principle between the original and the amended clause 16, in view of the statement made by the First Minister of the Northwest Territories (Mr. Haultain) to the same effect, which statement I have just endeavoured to make plain by an examination and comparison of the original

MR. BRISTOL.