

fathers of confederation, I feel satisfied that our duty will lead us to vote for this Bill.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, at the outset of what remarks I have to offer to the House, I feel I can to a certain extent and in a certain qualified manner offer my congratulations to my learned and honourable friend—because I understand that my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Hall) is of the same profession as myself—on the marvellous ability and the wonderful mental dexterity and alertness which he has displayed in making, by a circuitous route, a very careful road around this subject. Round and round the subject, after the calm and deliberate discussion of this House for many weeks, that hon. gentleman has travelled. Nothing could induce him to get to the centre of the subject and to touch the real question involved, namely, for what reason or purpose and with what object parliament is trying to force these objectionable clauses on the people of the Northwest provinces. My hon. friend will perhaps be able, when he goes back to his constituents, to congratulate himself upon their lack of memory of all these things, because, Sir, he does constantly associate, I believe, with gentlemen who are very anxious indeed to forget some things, and, therefore, when my hon. friend goes back to his constituents and is brought face to face with the remarks which he has made to this House in support of this Bill, perhaps my hon. friend, like a man well known to him, from his own riding, who in this province has won doubtful fame—will also ask them, 'Can't you forget some things.' My friend, perhaps, may wish with regard at least to one portion of his speech that his constituents would and could forget the expression of opinion which he has in cold type in 'Hansard.' My friend has stated that the resolution offered in amendment by the leader of the opposition, to use his own words, savoured of bigotry and intolerance. We have had some extraordinary propositions from hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate, but this proposition enunciated by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Hall) is the most extraordinary. The language and the clear intent of that amendment contradict the hon. gentleman. The desire has been evident on that side of the House, even before this debate commenced, to make it appear that any gentleman on this side of the House raising his voice in opposition to this Bill and saying that some drastic clauses are objectionable, is rousing passion and prejudice in this country and encouraging that current of passion which created such trouble in this country in 1896, an imputation which rests now heavy as a dark cloud over the government. What is the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition? At the risk of monotony I shall read it to the House:

Upon the establishment of a province in the Northwest Territories of Canada as proposed

by Bill (No. 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 full powers of provincial self-government including power to exclusively make laws in relation to education.

What does that mean? My hon. friend talks of a desire expressed on the part of the leader of the opposition to impose something on the new provinces to which they were not subject before. I am not so well versed and so astute in reading statutes as he has shown himself in his speech, but I desire to say that I cannot by any stretch of my imagination, by any stretch of logic, by any kind of trite reasoning read into that amendment any other than a moderate desire to adhere strictly to the lines of provincial rights and not to take away from the provinces those rights which appertain to provinces, the withdrawal of which rights would be a violation of the constitution. I am sorry to say, Sir, that is the sort of reasoning that in several instances we have heard on this clause. Much is it to be regretted, and my friend will live to regret that ever the accusation of intolerance was thrown across the floor of this House against the leader of the opposition in connection with that amendment. That charge will not bear the light, the language of that amendment refutes the charge and the only conclusion, the only inference one can draw from the attack which has been made upon my honoured leader is the conclusion that my hon. friend desires to throw across the floor of the House an imputation which is absolutely groundless. My hon. friend has invoked the dictum of Edward Blake that it is a good thing to tell the people beforehand what law they are going to have. That is an excellent proposition and one to which nobody can take exception, but do we forget that the tide of immigration which set in many years ago has been steadily flowing into these western countries, and that it has been flowing into these western countries as the result of a policy inaugurated by this or a former government under a Minister of the Interior. Do we forget that representations have been made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when Minister of the Interior, with regard to what these immigrants may expect in the shape of education? Does my hon. friend deny that the ex-Minister of the Interior has for years circulated abroad pamphlets to the effect that the schools in the Northwest are non-sectarian or national schools? If so, it is a good thing to tell the people beforehand what to expect and when that cloud of immigration comes in and settles down and the new settlers, if this Bill passes, ask: Where are the non-sectarian schools spoken of in the pamphlets? What answer would my hon. friend be disposed to give them? Would he be disposed to answer with the