

may be a degree of right in practically every contention and we have also been taught that men who were sincerely desirous of serving their country could nearly always get together and with mutual respect and mutual forbearance agree upon a course, which, while it might not satisfy the extremists on either side, would be acceptable to the sound common sense of the great majority. Mr. Speaker, during this debate I confess that I have been amazed at the intemperance of some of the remarks that have been made on both sides of this House. I confess that possibly I know more about the inflammable materials that there are in this country than some of the hon. members who have made these utterances. In most mining communities there are laws which prohibit, under the severest penalty, a man from carrying a naked lamp into a coal mine where there are noxious gases liable to explode; and a special lamp has been invented with a wire screen about it that will give light but will not cause ignition. So it is possible for a miner to pass through the noxious and explosive gases with his safety lamp and to come out unharmed. I think that, in a debate of this kind, where men's minds are likely to be embittered and where their sentiments are liable to become overwrought, we should travel with a safety lamp. All the light that is required on the subject can be thrown by a safety lamp, but the fire which would cause combustion is not necessary to a discussion of this character. So, I feel that we should, in dealing with this question, deal with it absolutely upon the merits of the case, each man following what he believes to be right from his own point of view. I have not been very long a member of this House. I do not know how long I may be a member of this House, but whatever record I leave behind me I want to be chiefly remembered for this, that, while I was here, my influence was for peace and not for war, that my influence was to build up and not to tear down, to heal and not to hurt. We have in this Dominion elements derived from different origins. We have come from different countries. There is one race here by right by discovery, there is another race here by right of conquest, but the country belongs to us both alike. To this mixed people there has been given a great task to work out. No nation in the world has been more beneficently endowed by the Creator than have we Canadians and there is a call—an insistent call—for us to be up and doing and to work out the development of this great inheritance. To properly accomplish this task, I believe it is absolutely necessary that we should be able to work together in unison and harmony, and anything that seems to have the appearance of a breach of faith, anything that appears to a large section of the community to be a violation of an agreement, is something that the people of this coun-

Mr. AMES.

try should carefully and studiously avoid. We can only have unity if we have mutual trust in one another and that is impossible if a portion of the community is under the impression that this parliament does not keep the obligations that have been entered into. Therefore, although I am very reluctant in some respects to break with my colleagues; on this particular question I must do so, and I feel that when clause 16 is called in committee I shall find it necessary to support the government.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, this question has already been so exhaustively discussed that it is very difficult for one at this stage of the debate to address himself to the subject without retreating to a very large extent ground which has already been gone over by others. But the matter is one of such deep interest in the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House, as I believe it is of deep interest in every constituency throughout Canada, that I feel that I would be recreant to my duty if I did not at least state the views which I hold in respect to it. Let me say then at once, Sir, that I am in full sympathy with the establishment of self-government in the Northwest. I think that the time has come when that great and rapidly developing portion of our country, comprising as it does that great fertile belt which is the hope of our future, is entitled to provincial autonomy, not the mock autonomy which is provided by this Bill, but a real, genuine autonomy which will enable the new provinces to govern themselves independently in matters of provincial concern and place them upon a footing of equality with the other settled portions of this confederation. It is because this Bill which is now before the House, while purporting to grant such autonomy, so restricts and circumscribes the legislative powers which are granted as practically to destroy their value and to make the whole scheme of the government a delusion and a sham that I am opposed to the measure as it stands and intend to vote for the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I think, Mr. Speaker, that this House has never had a more striking illustration of a misnomer than is exhibited by the application to this Bill of the name 'autonomy.' I think the Bill would be more accurately described if it were to be called a restriction rather than an Autonomy Bill. The autonomy which it embodies is, to my mind, very much of the same character as the permission which a timid and considerate mother gave to her daughter who asked to be allowed to go out and swim to which request the mother replied:

Yes, my darling daughter,  
Go hang your clothes on a hickory limb  
And don't go near the water.