

convictions in that regard, the right hon. leader of the government stood no longer upon the rock of the constitution but he had shifted the pedestal on which he stood to a sand bank. There is no question about that, and I will tell the House where the confirmation of the views of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition stands. The confirmation of his views stands in this way that there is not one hon. gentleman on that side of the House since his speech was delivered who has made any attempt whatever to controvert his statements. No successful controversion of his statements has been made, and I say that when so much doubt has been placed upon the constitutional point there is only one course which will satisfy the public mind that can be taken by the right hon. leader of the government, and that is to have the point in dispute submitted to the Privy Council in England along with all other questions which should be submitted, so that we may have this constitutional question absolutely decided one way or the other and so that there may be no further controversy upon the point. It is the duty of the government and the duty of the right hon. gentleman not to press this clause upon the House, but to submit for one question: Do the subsections of clause 93 of the British North America Act apply to these provinces? If they do that settles the question. If they do not a further question should be submitted as to whether or not this government has any power to go any further and force these separate schools upon these two provinces.

There is not only that question which is in doubt, but we all know, after listening to the speech of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that a conflict of opinion has arisen between him and the premier of the Northwest Territories. We have read the interview with the premier of the Northwest Territories published in last Friday's 'News,' in which that gentleman contends that if clause 16 is passed in its present shape, it will impose upon the new provinces exactly the state of affairs which existed in 1875 after the passage of the Act of that year giving the Territories the constitution they now enjoy. In the face of all these doubtful points of law affecting the constitution, there should be a submission to the Privy Council in England, perhaps to the Supreme Court first, and the public mind would be set at rest by a decision from that quarter in a way in which it could not be otherwise. I do not propose to take up the time of the House any longer on this question, because I think that at this late stage of the debate speeches should be curtailed as far as possible; but I would make this appeal to the right hon. leader of the government, to submit the points I have mentioned: First, as to whether or not the subsections of section 93 of the British North America Act apply to these new provinces. Second, if

Mr. WARD.

they do not, has the government power to pass this legislation? And, third, does clause 16 give greater powers than are on the face of it intended?

I have nothing further to say upon this question, except to express the hope that in future there will be no necessity for any unkind remarks to be made from either side of the House. We on this side of the House have been accused of fomenting this agitation in the country. Well, that is for the public to decide. I contend that this measure, as it was originally proposed in this House by the right hon. leader of the government, has done more to foment and bring about the state of affairs that exists in this country to-day than anything else, and I do not believe that there has been one thing said on this side of the House that would induce the people to agitate in any sense of the word. I, therefore, trust, after the whole matter is over and the question is decided one way or the other, that we shall have peace, good order and good government in this country.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said upon this question; almost every phase of it has been threshed out; and after all that has been said on both sides of the House and all that has been written in the various newspapers, I would have said nothing upon the question, but that if I gave a silent vote, it might be inferred that I was unwilling to say one word in favour of this Bill. I would not have it supposed for one moment that I wished to shirk any responsibility which rests upon me in this regard. I think the House and you, Mr. Speaker, will agree that I have not troubled the House very much or spoken unduly on every subject that came before it since I have been a member. I do not think any one can accuse me of that terrible disease which has been properly termed a running at the mouth. If there is one disease which I abhor above another, it is that; and I only feel justified in speaking on subjects in which I am specially interested. With reference to this Bill, more perhaps has been said and written upon it in the city of Toronto than in any other place in the Dominion of Canada. It is there that the great volcanic eruption has taken place; the great craters are found in the newspaper offices and on the platforms of that city. I have great respect for the people of Toronto and for the papers published there; but I must say that it is not conferred upon any newspaper or any city to know all that is to be known in this world. It is not permitted to any one individual to monopolize all the intelligence in the country; and I think there are other sections of the Dominion of Canada, particularly in the province of Ontario, that should be heard from, that have views entirely different from those set forth in some of the newspapers and expressed on most of