

must consult three of the other provinces before he can accede to it. But his own supporters are coming from Winnipeg to protest against such treatment. The Board of Trade and the city council are sending down deputations, and I trust the right hon. gentleman will give some satisfaction to these representatives and remove the impression created by his own press that the reason why the application of Manitoba is denied is because the government of that province will not change its school laws. As a singular indefiniteness characterizes the utterances of the First Minister regarding his intentions with respect to this measure, I am not in a position to discuss it at present. He has not yet explained why he did not consult his own colleagues and responsible ministers, the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) or why he did not consult on this educational clause the First Minister of the Northwest Territories. Who then did he consult? Did he consult the other members of the cabinet? Perhaps not, except the sub-committee which drafted the clause. It may turn out that until noon on the day the Bill was introduced, the other members of the cabinet knew nothing about that clause. I am forced to the conclusion that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) did know about it because he was a member of the sub-committee, but I am somewhat shocked at his success in swallowing himself as he has done. I have here a record of the views he held in 1896 regarding provincial jurisdiction. Let me read a few words of the speech he delivered in this House on March 20th of that year, pages 4189 and 4190 of 'Hansard':—

There are seven provinces in this Dominion. There is territory out of which to carve many more. There is a minority in every province. Shall we to-day, hastily, thoughtlessly and without due consideration, without first exhausting every other means of settlement, legislate as is proposed by this Bill, and place upon our statute-book a statutory invitation to the minority in every province now existing, and every province that may hereafter be carved out of our territory, to appeal to the people's representatives in this parliament to settle questions that might be better settled, under the spirit of the Confederation Act, by the provinces in which those questions arise.

Here is a distinct statement by the Postmaster General that, according to the spirit of the Act of Confederation, these questions should be settled, not by the Dominion parliament, but by the provincial legislatures where they arise. He then realized that the question of education should be left as a matter of provincial concern, to provincial jurisdiction. But as a member of the sub-committee which drafted this clause, he took entirely different ground.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

I do not desire to weary the House any longer. I simply rose, as a western representative, to protest most strongly against the course of the government in deciding this question and others incidental to it in the absence of that representative in the cabinet from the west whom the people of that country can hold particularly responsible. If the right hon. gentleman wants to give the people directly interested an opportunity to make their views known, let him select a representative from the west to replace in the cabinet the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) and have him go back to the people for election. If he should be re-elected, then the right hon. gentleman will be in a position to say that the people of the west have given their sanction to this Bill and the other provinces should not press further any objections. I would urge, the right hon. gentleman to adopt that mode of procedure without delay and not push the Bill through the House first and then invite a representative from the west to enter his cabinet. Let the people of that country be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion and let them have a representative in the cabinet to whom they can look to vindicate their rights.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA ELECTRIC COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 12) respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Gallihier.

On the preamble,

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, before the preamble is carried, perhaps I ought to say that as the first sections of this Bill deal with arranging for sufficient capital to buy stock in another company that exists and is doing business in the city, the objection that the city takes to the Bill is that if the powers that are asked for by the Ottawa Electric Company are granted, then it follows that they will purchase the stock of the other company and thereby destroy competition. I do not know what the promoter of the Bill has to say; but if that is the object of the Bill, I am here to enter my protest on behalf of the city against the preamble.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that this Bill was held back for a length of time until some arrangement was reached, and that it was finally referred to a special committee, and that that special committee reported. But while the Bill seemed to be specially objectionable, there is one feature of it—the power to increase the capital stock—to which I understand there is no general op-