

right, but if we cannot let us have them any way. What is the use of Protestants starving religion out of the schools and depriving their children of religious instruction for the sake of a few dollars? Why should we hold out for a thing that Roman Catholics cannot and will not accept? Is it not a proper thing for us as Protestants who have children to educate them in our own way? There is nothing in so far as the different Protestant bodies are concerned that will prevent them from having their children educated together in the same classes, taught by the same teachers or from receiving religious instructions upon grounds common to all Protestant bodies.

I was talking about this amendment. A great deal of fault is found because we have this amendment. I submit that this amendment is not legislation of this House. It is legislation that was passed by the legislature of the Northwest Territories. They are just as fully represented in their local House as the province of Manitoba. According to their size and population they have just as many representatives in the local legislature of the Northwest Territories as any local parliament of Canada. They have a government, they have a premier, they have all the powers that a local legislature has except that they cannot borrow money and the longer that power is kept from them, I think, the better. This is an Act they have passed themselves. The Northwest Territories have passed this legislation and they appear to be perfectly satisfied with it and we have some evidence in its favour. We heard the speech the other evening by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), an opponent of this government. He put himself on record in connection with these schools, and what he says is this:

I intend to claim the privilege of briefly putting on record the views which I hold with regard to this question. After nearly twenty-two years residence in the Northwest Territories, I believe firmly that the public school system as at present administered is the one best suited to the needs of the country.

That is the view of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle about the legislation that we are dealing with. He says that he has had twenty-two years experience in the Northwest, that he has seen many changes and that this law which is now on the statute-book has given satisfaction to that country. Mr. Haultain himself says about this Act that he has had some experience of it as premier, and he says:

If I were dictator I would not change one line of it.

It is perfectly satisfactory to the premier, it is perfectly satisfactory to the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, and as far as we can find out it is perfectly satisfactory to every man who knows anything about education in the west. Now, if it is so satisfactory and if we are keeping it in the constitution

of the provinces, what is the matter with it? Is it not the right thing to do? Is it not right that we should have permanent institutions and not be subject to every change of doctrine that may come about from one day to another? It may be necessary for me, on account of some statements that were made about this Act, to deal to some extent with some of its provisions. I am sorry that in the part of the country that I come from some of the clergy have been a little bit carried away by the agitation that has been going on in connection with this Act. I find this letter in some newspaper published in the part of the country I come from and when I read to this House certain provisions of the Education Act, I think it will be observed that there is no very great justification for this letter which was written by a reverend gentleman for whom the whole country, myself amongst others, has the greatest respect. I am only sorry that he did not take the trouble to learn for himself what the provisions of this Act are before he made such a pronouncement. He says:

But to be perfectly frank, what is asked in this Autonomy Bill is not separate denominational schools; there is no mention of Russian or Jew or Anglican or Presbyterian, what is asked is the recognition and public maintenance of Roman Catholic schools which the ratepayer is to support whatever his religious views may be. That is not equal educational privileges for all, this is not even the principle of separate schools, this is discrimination, it is the selection of one class of denominational schools for public support for all time and this without any reference to the public supervision of the teaching staff either in the matter of its appointment or its qualifications. Surely one is not to be called unjust and bigoted because he hesitates at fastening on posterity an unequal school system so pregnant with discord and strife as this is sure to be. Rather it would seem does the injustice lie in making any discrimination at all.

When we see what the provisions of this Act are, I think it is a pity that this reverend gentlemen who has put a little time on this question, at all events, enough time to enable him to write this letter, did not give it a little more attention, before he came to the conclusion that this Act was such an awful thing as he seems to think it is.

In the province of Nova Scotia we have a public free school system, the law governing which has been on the statute-books since 1864, but since then it has been several times amended. I have had something to do with the school legislation of Nova Scotia, and I know its provisions very well. I must say that so far as I know the Nova Scotia School Act, and comparing it with the Northwest Territories Education Act, I am inclined to believe that the latter is more full in its provisions, and, taking it all round, a better law. I would like our Nova Scotia friends to understand what