

hon. gentleman say 'hear, hear' to the circumstance that this government, a powerful government, as it describes itself, entrenched in power, had not the courage to put up a candidate in Centre Toronto, but allowed that election to go by default. I would have thought that one of the notable events to which the hon. Minister of Finance might very well have called attention. There is only one portion of the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice with which I am not inclined to agree, and that is the suggestion that it would not have been proper for him to have made this explanation on the second reading of the Bill. I think the hon. Minister of Justice could not have had in mind what took place in the debate when he made that statement, because, beginning with the right hon. Prime Minister and including, I think, every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who spoke on the second reading, there was a prolonged discussion on clause 16 as amended compared with clause 16 as originally introduced. I thought I must be under a misapprehension for a moment and I looked up the speech delivered by my right hon. friend the First Minister in this House on the 22nd March, and I found, just exactly as I thought, at page 2924, that he began in this way:

Now, Sir, a word as to the changes which we have made in that clause.

And he goes on to discuss that. The greater part of the speech of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was devoted to clause 16 as amended compared with clause 16 as originally drafted. The whole burthen of his speech was to show what in his estimation was the difference in effect between the original and amended clauses. Therefore, I cannot agree, with the view of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in that regard; but he did not see fit to make that explanation, and I for one am quite prepared to assent to his suggestion that clause 16 shall stand over for the present upon the condition to which I have already referred. The hon. gentleman has always been most courteous in assenting to any proposition of that kind from this side of the House, and I think it is due to him under the circumstances which he has mentioned to assent to what he has himself suggested in that regard. I would like, however, to say that it may not be convenient for me to be present to-morrow and therefore, if it will suit my hon. friend's convenience, I should be glad to have the consideration of that clause postponed until a later date.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will speak on Monday afternoon. I had expected in the interval to be able to get through the other clauses of the Bill, but whether we get through the other clauses of the Bill or not, if it suits my hon. friend's convenience, I will speak on Monday afternoon.

185

Mr. LAKE. I just wish to take this opportunity of saying that I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has given his definite promise, but I desire also to call his attention to some very positive statements that he made in his speech on the second reading of this Bill, statements so inaccurate and so misleading that the true facts ought to be laid before the House. They were statements made for the purpose of proving that the Northwest Territories were satisfied with the restrictions upon their power to pass such legislation in regard to education as they saw fit. If these statements had been correct they would have added some weight to the hon. gentleman's argument. We find that the hon. gentleman's statement was as follows, I quote from 'Hansard' page 5348:

It has been suggested that the Territories wish to rid themselves of this incubus of separate schools, and we have been referred to a resolution that was passed by the Territorial Assembly in October, 1889, asking that a humble address be presented, praying that an Act be passed to repeal subsection 1 of section 14. True, such a resolution was passed in 1889, but let me draw attention to a resolution which was passed in 1890, the following year. In that year the following resolution was passed:

'Moved by Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Brett, that whereas on the 29th October, 1889, this House passed the following resolution, viz:

Resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, the Senate and the House of Commons praying that an Act be passed amending the Northwest Territory Act by repealing subsection 1 of section 14 after the word 'education' in the second line.

And whereas such address was duly presented by way of memorial passed on the 6th November, 1889,

And whereas no action has been taken on the subject by the parliament of Canada;

Therefore, be it resolved that this House reaffirm the vote as taken on the said 29th October, 1889, and respectfully request that the said memorial as above mentioned shall receive careful consideration by the parliament of Canada at its next session and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of State.'

With time and consideration came wisdom. That resolution was put to the House and how did it result? Six voted in favour of it, and 15 against it. And there this agitation with respect to the repeal of the provisions of the Act having reference to separate schools ended, and we have heard nothing of it since. And of course, the present Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Haultain, voted against the resolution and in favour of maintaining the present condition.

Of course, these words 'in favour' cannot be interpreted literally, and I do not suppose the hon. Minister of Justice intended them to be so interpreted, but in reference to the preceding sentences—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Lake) is pointing out inaccuracies. Was that resolution introduced?