

An hon. MEMBER. Would the hon. gentleman give us the figures of Quebec in that same general election.

Mr. BOLE. The province of Quebec, that priest-ridden province, that intolerant province, declared by a majority of 3 or 4 to 1 that this Remedial Bill providing for separate schools along denominational lines should not be imposed upon the province, one of whose constituencies I have the honour to represent in this House. Then, Mr. Speaker, should I listen to the voice of Ontario? I heard my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) quote the other night, and he quoted with apparent joy, the remarks made by my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he was campaigning in the county of Haldimand in 1896, stating that the coat was the coat of a Conservative government, but the voice was the voice of the church. Now, Mr. Speaker, which shall I turn to, shall I touch the garment or shall I listen to the voice of the church? I will do neither, I will accept the conditions just as I find them. I will look at all the surrounding circumstances of the case and will form my own conclusion.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. gentleman tell us how the province of Manitoba voted in 1896?

Mr. BOLE. I have already given the figures, but for the benefit of the hon. gentleman I will say again that by a vote of 15,459 against 14,592 the province of Manitoba voted in favour of the imposition upon itself of the separate schools provided for in the Remedial Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to state to this House very briefly my own opinion with respect to the school question. My judgment is that in view of the conflicting opinions expressed by eminent constitutional lawyers, both inside and outside this House, with respect to the application of section 93 and other sections of the British North America Act, it is the duty of parliament to interpret the clauses of that Act and give to the new provinces a constitutional certainty without which it is impossible to expect proper educational and social development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the several propositions before the House? We have the proposition of the right hon. the leader of the government which provides that the school system now in force in the Northwest Territories shall be made permanent. We have also the proposal of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) which provides that the people of the Territories shall have a free hand subject to and in accordance with the British North America Act, 1867. We have had also a proposal from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) which has not yet been crystallized into a definite principle for our consideration, but which however has been anticipated by him, that

these new provinces should have unreservedly the right to legislate with respect to matters of education. I propose to very briefly give my opinion with respect to these different proposals and after that to give my reasons for supporting one and rejecting the others.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BOLE. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock I was proceeding to give expression to the views which influence my opinion on the important subject which is engaging the attention of the House. My own position briefly stated is: that in view of the conflicting opinions expressed by eminent lawyers both inside and outside of the House with respect to the application of clause 93 and other clauses of the British North America Act, it is the duty of this parliament to interpret these clauses into the Bill, in line with the spirit of the constitution, and give to the new provinces a constitutional certainty without which it is impossible to expect satisfactory social and educational progress. What are the propositions now before the House? We have in the first place the amended clause introduced by the right hon. the Prime Minister, confirming to the new provinces that system of education which is at present enjoyed by the people of the Territories. We have in the second place, the amendment of the leader of the opposition which provides that the people of the new provinces shall have a free hand subject to and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act. We have later on, the proposition in embryo of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) which in effect is that the new provinces shall have unreservedly the right to legislate with respect to matters of education. I shall very briefly state my position with respect to these three propositions, and I shall give my reasons for approving of one and rejecting the others. In the first place, I claim that the amended clause as proposed by the leader of the government contains an element of certainty, is in line with the spirit of the constitution, and is acceptable to the great majority of the people of the Territories. On the other hand, the proposal of the leader of the opposition is not certain; it invites litigation and it promises to have imposed upon the people of the new provinces by the courts a constitution with respect to educational matters which might tie the hands of the new provinces, thereby defeating the aim and purpose of that amendment. The third proposal made by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) is not yet crystallized in the shape of a resolution, but so far as I can understand it is objec-