

be no misapprehension as to the stand I take on this question :

Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed by Bill 69, the legislature of such province, subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, is entitled to and should enjoy powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

That is a charter of rights that I believe will bring no trouble on this Dominion ; it is a charter of rights that should receive the sanction of members on both sides of this House. Whether you are in favour of separate schools or whether you are against them you are not called upon to pronounce under that amendment ; you simply say that by the constitution educational matters are left in the hands of those who govern the province, and that with these two provinces they shall remain. We will not be party to taking these rights away from them. That is the safest and best course ; and I believe, in the light of all that has taken place in this debate, that if any other course should be pursued by us than that of allowing these new provinces full autonomy, with all the rights to which they are entitled under the British North America Act, hon. gentlemen will be creating a situation in this country that will be both critical and difficult to overcome. I trust that ere it is too late the government may see fit to withdraw those clauses from the Bill. Let us have a unanimous voice on this great question ; let us send this constitution to the Northwest Territories as a free gift from this parliament, given generously, given unanimously, given by all parties. We are all striving for the one end, we are all wishing for the common weal, and, although we may take different courses, I believe that the great bulk of men, both in this House and in this country, are striving to make good that prayer which we, Mr. Speaker, every day use in this House :

Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is done in Heaven.

Mr. J. CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall be able to strike the pace set by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), who has just taken his seat, for, in the first place, I doubt if I shall be able to speak as loudly as that hon. gentleman has done. The hon. member (Mr. Cockshutt) made a remark to the effect that the right hon. the Prime Minister has associated with foreign individuals. I do not know that I would have any objection to the leader of the government visiting any foreign representative of any church or any state. I think, for instance, if I were in Rome myself I would be only too pleased to call on the Pope. Then, too, what do we find amongst our friends of the opposition to-day ? Do we find a condition of things different to that

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

which exists among members on this side of the House ? Only a few days ago the representatives of the Conservative government of Manitoba visited the representative in Ottawa of the Pope, and only yesterday in Rome the late leader of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, is reported in the Montreal 'Gazette' to have visited the Pope in Rome.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Too bad.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know that I should take any great exception to the fact of the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper paying a visit to the Pope when he is in Rome, but I think our hon. friends on the other side of the House should be liberal enough to extend to other people the same privilege. I shall read the article to which I have referred :

Received by the Pope.

Rome, April 13.—After an audience in which he dwelt on the ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese of Antigonish, Bishop Cameron presented Sir Charles Tupper to the Pope, recalling his constant defence of the rights of Canadian Catholics. The Pope, speaking in Latin, said he knew of the struggles sustained by Sir Charles and praised him warmly and putting his hand on Sir Charles' shoulder he gave him his special blessing.

I do not like to see hon. members on the opposition side of the House or anywhere else try to make capital out of something in which there is nothing, and that is practically what is being done in a very great part of the discussion that has taken place in this debate. They have gone far from the question before the House, they have taken up a great deal of valuable time, both of the House and of the country. I should like to tell the people of Canada that we are squandering their money here to-day by thousands, almost by hundreds of thousands, in continuing this debate. Yet every member has decided weeks ago the position he will take on this Bill. Members opposite know their position as well as we do, but they are continuing this debate day after day simply for the purpose of having their words printed in 'Hansard' to spread over this country, not for any good or any benefit which it will do to this country. I do not intend to go into the legal aspects of this question. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion from day to day, and I have come to the conclusion that even those whose minds have been educated along legal lines have failed to come to any fixed opinion as to what our powers really are in connection with the matter now before us. I might, as others have done, quote the opinions of eminent men, the opinions of Hon. Edward Blake, Hon. George Brown, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Sir John A. Macdonald, and a great many others. The last opinion which I have noticed is that of Mr. Christopher Robinson, and if hon. mem-