

tion 16, No. 1, omitting these immaterial words, is as follows :

The minority of the ratepayers therein (that is to say, in any established school district), whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

That is the essential and material part of section 16, No. 1, so far as it perpetuates the right of separate schools in the new provinces in the Northwest Territories. Now let us read chapter 29, section 41, of the Northwest ordinances once more, and see how the words of that section, which is perpetuated by section 16, No. 2, compare with those I have just read :

The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

There are the same identical words with one or two absolutely minor and immaterial changes, the words of chapter 29, section 41, on the one hand, perpetuated by section 16, No. 2, and on the other hand, the words of the Act of 1875 which I have just read, perpetuated as a part of the constitution of the Territories by section 16, No. 1. The expressions in both cases are in meaning absolutely the same, and in form of expression almost identical. To sum up : Section 16, No. 1, according to the view of the government as expressed by the Minister of Justice, brought into force the Act of 1875, both by means of section 93 of the British North America Act and by direct re-enactment in subsection 2 of that section ; section 16, No. 2, brings into force the same Act of 1875 by preserving all rights under chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances, in which chapters everything in this respect contained in the Act of 1875, is directly set forth and re-enacted. In other words, section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, proceed by different routes, but arrive at precisely the same goal in that regard.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, at page 5985 of 'Hansard,' uses language which was apparently intended to suggest that under section 16, No. 2, less rights and privileges are accorded to the minority than under section 16, No. 1. I have already demonstrated, to my own satisfaction at least, that section 16, No. 2, gives all that the Territorial Act of 1875 give, because it practically re-enacts it; in truth, however, it seems to me to give more : in the first place it gives the right of separation which is the only thing given by the Act of 1875. The expression 'separate schools' is not a technical expression ; it has not so far

as I understand any technical meaning ; it means exactly what it says : the right of separation. Section 16, No. 2, also gives the half hour of religious instruction and this was not guaranteed by the Act of 1875. The position then of the hon. member for Brandon is this : that he resigned as a cabinet minister because of the provision of section 16, No. 1, and he came back under the provisions of section 16, No. 2, which, so far as the character of the schools is concerned concedes all and more than all that was guaranteed by the Act of 1875. And yet, he reflects upon his colleagues by referring to his own independent action, laughs at the draughtsman who framed these clauses, and professes thoroughly to understand the effect of section 16, No. 2. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) if he were here, that the next time he undertakes to set his wits against those of the draughtsman, in the preparation of Bills, it would be well for him to get some member of the profession to come to his assistance, because I think I have already demonstrated (and I intend to still more fully demonstrate) that in this respect the hon. gentleman does not know exactly where he stands, and that instead of section 16, No. 2, being any concession to the opinions which he voiced in this House, section 16, No. 2, goes further away from these opinions and from the policy which he has expressed in the past than did section 16, No. 1.

Section 16, No. 1, contains certain provisions with regard to state aid ; section 16, No. 2, also contains certain provisions with regard to state aid. The hon. member for Brandon was very much exercised about the possibilities under section 16, No. 1. He said, speaking in this House, 'Hansard,' page 3106 :

I am fairly confident that it is an opinion that will be justified by any court to which it may be referred, that the effect of that clause will be that if twenty years from now the province of Alberta undertook to appropriate \$250,000 to build and equip a provincial university, a proportionate amount of money, proportionate to the number of separate schools as compared with the public schools, would have to be set aside for the establishment of a separate school institution.

Let us look at the provisions of section 16, No. 1. They are as follows :

In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education and in the distribution of any 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 equitable shares or proportions.

The provision in section 16, No. 2, is as follows :