

blish separate schools therein—and in such case, the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

I find that in 1889, a petition was sent to the Dominion authorities by the local legislature at Regina, of which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was then a member, praying to this effect:

That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, the Senate and the House of Commons, praying for the amendment of 'The Northwest Territories Act' by repealing that portion of subsection 1 of section 14 after the word 'education' in the second line.

And the hon. member for Edmonton supported that. So did the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), then a member of the assembly. Thus they prayed this administration that everything that had to do with education should be shut out of the law, which would leave the province a free hand with the matter of education. In view of that point, I think that hardly all the facts were stated by the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) when he said that there was no feeling in the Northwest with regard to this Bill and no objection taken to it. If the prayer of the petitions had been granted, I think these gentlemen would have been in nearly the same position as the amendment of the leader of the opposition would place them in. Apparently, their opinions have changed. But it did not stop at the point I have indicated. In the following session of the legislative assembly, they repeated their prayer. And the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for East Assiniboia supported that contention, that education should be left entirely to the provinces. Now, apparently, they have changed their mind as they did with regard to the land policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, in proceeding to discuss these educational clauses of these Bills, I cannot say that I shall be able to show, but shall contend, that the amendments presented to this House to-day do not differ in the slightest degree from the original Bill as brought down. But, before I proceed to discuss the amendment and the original Bill let me point out the contrast between the position taken by the right hon. leader of the government and the ex-Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

The right hon. the First Minister has said in introducing the Bill that it was obligatory upon this government to preserve certain rights and conditions which by reason of good faith were inviolable, and lest I should misquote him I shall read what he said. These rights and conditions are inviolable because they are given under the Act of 1875, and he says:

It is open to any man to break his word, it is open to any man to violate his engagement, it is open to any man to trample under foot his plighted troth. Now if it is open to any man to do that, it is also open to parliament; and if it be the view that parliament is not bound by the acts of any preceding parliament, that parliament may violate its plighted troth, then we have a double opportunity on this occasion to signalize ourselves.

Proceeding further in reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption:

But does anybody in this House think of removing from the Canadian Pacific Railway the powers and immunities which have been granted to that company? Does anybody in this House think for a moment of giving to those new provinces the power to levy taxation upon the Canadian Pacific Railway? No, we respect our engagements. Then I ask if we respect our engagements in the one case, why should we not respect our engagements in the other case.

That is the position he took that certain rights under the Act of 1875 were created and were inviolable. He took the position that these rights which were created should be guaranteed to the minority. But the hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has endeavoured to show that there is a vast difference between the rights of the minorities under the Act of 1875 and their right to-day under local ordinances. He said that under the Act of 1875 the minority were entitled to and were given a complete dual system. This is what he says on page 3239:

That was the clause in the Act of 1875. I read it because it is important in view of the remarks I intend to address to the House, that its exact terms should be in the minds of the gentlemen who are honouring me with their attention.

What followed the passage of this law? There was established in the Northwest Territories a complete dual system of schools.

Further down on the same page he says:

This system went on for some time in the Territories, and then the legislature began to interfere and to curtail the privileges of the separate schools. This curtailment proceeded from time to time until the year 1892 when what was known as the dual system was entirely swept away and that system which we have in the Northwest Territories, substantially as we have at present, was established.

So there is a vast difference in the views taken by the right hon. the First Minister and the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). There is a vast difference between the rights conferred under the Act of 1875 and under the ordinances according to the member for Brandon. The hon. member for Brandon has compared these rights and further says that these rights were conferred under the Act of 1875 and that the local ordinances curtailing them were unconstitutional and ultra vires. He will not consent to the preservation of the conditions which are inviolable, but he will agree to perpetuate the curtailed rights, although he intimated that such an invasion was an illegal and uncon-