

ing in the debate on the second reading, the ministers of the cabinet could take absolutely different positions and take them some distance apart from each other, and with a proper steering arrangement they could keep from closely clashing with each other. But the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs and other ministers must have been very shortsighted not to know that there was coming a time when they would have to come to close quarters, that they could not simply divide themselves off by an hour between speeches and come to conclusions which were absolutely different from each other, but they would have to come to a point where they would have to fight at close quarters, they would have to fight between themselves and fight it out as it is now being fought out between two colleagues sitting on benches close to each other; the Minister of Justice who has to take the legal view, and the Minister of Finance who calls the Minister of Justice his legal adviser and who has got to square himself now before this House and the public. If there was one thing in the argument of the Finance Minister it was this: What is all this pother about? What are you Protestants talking about, anyway? What are you opponents of clerical, separate schools talking about, anyway? We are only going to perpetuate this Northwest system which, as it is working out to-day, is absolutely and essentially the same as national schools with the simple change that after half-past three you may have the different creeds assembled for clerical instruction or church instruction according to their creeds. The statement went, and it was meant to go, and it has gone from one end of this country to the other, that all that was to be given in perpetuation was simply that and nothing more. Does the Finance Minister hold to that to-day?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I hold to that to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. He holds to that to-day. Now, the hon. Minister of Justice, who is the keeper of the legal conscience of the hon. Minister of Finance, which is probably not so difficult a conscience to take charge of as the other part of the hon. Minister of Finance's conscience, sits right alongside of the Minister of Finance and says that is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. FIELDING. If he said so, I did not hear him.

Mr. FOSTER. He says that the very moment these clauses are passed and they become law the essence and power of the Act of 1875, which the hon. Minister of Finance says has since been whittled down to the little end of nothing, comes into force. There is an appeal on the other side and it is to be absolutely opposed to the appeal of the Finance Minister. Which of these two is right? The Minister of Finance, because he has declared that the Minister of

Justice is the keeper of his legal conscience, if he is honest with parliament and the country, must state in accordance with the Minister of Justice that when we pass and finish this legislation, in the province of Saskatchewan, the essence and power of separate schools are included in the law of 1875, that it is a constraining principle in the province for all its future and that under it every man or any man in the Northwest Territories can demand the full tale of separate schools in the essence and power that were given in 1875. Otherwise the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice who sits beside him are juggling with the people of the country. What is the Minister of Justice giving to the minority if what the Minister of Finance says is true? Will the Minister of Justice rise and say that when this legislation is passed and when it goes into force and becomes the constitution of the province of Saskatchewan the minority in that country has no claim to anything else in the way of separate schools except the mere name and the privilege of religious teaching for half an hour of the legal hours of the school day? I do not think he will. Now then to the ring-bolt these gentlemen have to come some time. They are a pair of noble brothers. These galleries have their eyes on them, the country has its eyes on them and in the interest of that frankness that the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) invoked when he said we must be frank and plain and say just what we mean, let us ask these two hon. gentlemen to take an hour or two together and form a statement which the two can sign as to what will exactly be given to the Northwest minority when these different sections are made into law. It will be an interesting hour's session. None of the sessions that have taken place for the concoction of this Bill will be a patch on the interest that will attach to the hour's session between the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, and it will be worthy of the most skilful draftsman in Ottawa to make a form of words that will reconcile the difference between these two ministers and will yet be plain so that the man on the street as he goes along will read and understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I sincerely hope that not only will the men in the galleries have their eyes on us, but that they will have their eyes on the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and if they and the country will be good enough to read what has been said here by both the hon. Minister of Finance and myself both of us will be content. I trust that they will read not only what we said but what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said. I must confess that I am embarrassed somewhat by the wealth of vocabulary of my hon. friends opposite. I have to deal with the high-water mark of separate schools, and with the ring-bolt of education and 'hand-springs of finance.' It is em-