

separate schools in the Territorial Bill, they were establishing them for all time to come. He did not wish to imply that they would have to be placed there; but, being a far-seeing man, he knew that the fact of that provision being made would be used for the purpose of perpetuating separate schools in those provinces; and it is well known that he was always opposed to separate schools. Now, what guarantee have we that the separate schools in these two provinces will continue as they are at the present time? I submit that we have no guarantee. We find that the provisions of the Bill are very hazy, so much so that lawyers might place very different interpretations upon it; and the ordinances only guide the Territories, but do not ensure the schools as they now exist being continued for all time to come. While no great hardship may be experienced at the present time, it will certainly be a hardship to the majority in newly settled districts to maintain two weak and sickly schools where there might be one vigorous and healthy school. The Territories have no guarantee whatever that these schools will remain for all time to come as they are at the present time. I suppose they could change them for a system of schools similar to what exists in the province of Ontario to-day. According to a judgment given by Mr. Justice McMahon some three months ago, there are one hundred and five teachers teaching in the separate schools of Ontario to-day who have never passed a legal examination. This is a serious state of affairs; and yet these teachers are going on teaching month after month. It is true they have appealed the case to a higher court, and I suppose it will ultimately go to the Privy Council. These teachers are now teaching contrary to the law, except that the late government gave them permits to teach until a decision of the higher court could be obtained. Many of these teachers are not educated. It is said that many of them are priests, who are educated; but many are ladies and others who have had no training whatever. The law with regard to separate schools in Ontario has been changed in many ways. For instance, the law provides that all taxes paid by corporations must be used for the support of the public schools; but a private Bill was passed providing that the Sturgeon Falls Pulp Company should divide its taxes between the public schools and the separate schools. If that state of affairs can be brought about in the province of Ontario, why could it not in these new provinces? The Minister of Customs endeavoured to make a point against the government of the Northwest Territories, particularly against Mr. Haultain, when he used these words:

Talk about Mr. Haultain not having been consulted. He was consulted frequently, but if he had never been consulted or if no Northwest member had ever been consulted, I ask what better indication can you have of the desire

Mr. BARR.

of the people of the Northwest Territories than their own legislation?

The legislation to which the Minister of Customs referred was a law of the Northwest council, of which Mr. Haultain was the head, particularly a law based on the school law which was handed down to them from this House. The law set forth that there should be an advisory board composed of not less than two Catholics and four Protestants. But it is only an advisory board; it is not clothed with any power except to advise the Minister of Education, and he can change the regulations at any time; so that we might have a very different state of affairs in the near future from what we have at the present time. To my mind it seems most extraordinary that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was not consulted and more extraordinary still that he himself did not make it a point to be present at the cabinet meetings when this matter was being decided. He well knew that these Bills were being prepared and he should have made it his duty to impress on his colleagues and the right hon. gentleman the necessity of having them passed upon by him before they were finally drafted. In not taking this action, I submit he was recreant to his duty. I submit that he did not do what was expected of him by the people of the Northwest. It is indeed extraordinary that on the subcommittee of the cabinet which undertook to frame those Bills, there was only one representative from Ontario while there were three from Quebec. Mr. Haultain, the premier of the Territories was not consulted, and Mr. Rogers from Manitoba informed us to-day that neither was he consulted, and we must conclude that it was decided by two or three representatives from Quebec that this clause No. 16 should be embodied in these Bills. It is evident that the First Minister took upon himself to bring down these Bills and force them through the House without consulting his colleagues, proving beyond doubt that we have to-day in this country a one man government. Let us for a moment look at the position occupied by this government to-day as compared with the one they took in 1896. In the election of 1896, the position I admit was a unique one. The late government was endeavouring to force on this House remedial legislation against the province of Manitoba. The right hon. gentleman, who was then leading the opposition, seized that opportunity to declare in the province of Quebec that if he were returned to power he would see that Manitoba gave the Catholic minority of that province what they desired. That was the stand taken by the Quebec wing of the right hon. gentleman's party, but what did they do in the province of Ontario? In the elections in 1896 in that province, I took a rather active part and had the pleasure of hearing the First Minister and the Postmaster General on several occasions, and the arrangement