

separate school. In neither of these places is there any agitation against the educational clauses in this Bill, and as an evidence of the entire absence of agitation in Prince Albert, I may say that even the Prince Albert Loyal Orange Lodge, are so satisfied with the existing state of affairs that they did not forward to me one word of protest in reference to the Bill. Sir, the Bill before the House is a most important measure. It is one of the most important measures that have come before the parliament of Canada since confederation. It is in all probability the most important for the two new provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, that may ever come before this House. It is a measure which ought to be considered, not from the standpoint of politics or political exigencies, not from the mere standpoint of sectarianism, but from a higher, a national standpoint, and in dealing with it we should ever keep before us the fact that our object is to build up a great Canadian nation. It is a matter of pride with me, Mr. Speaker, that on this important question, the people whom I have the honour to represent on the floor of this House have not considered this question from the mere standpoint of party politics, nor have they allowed the agitation which has prevailed in certain quarters, nor the appeals that have been made to prejudice and passion, to stir up strife and bitterness in their midst. But, Sir, they have risen to a loftier plane and they have treated this most delicate question with a breadth of thought and a toleration which to my mind speaks well for the future greatness of that western country. We well know that to build up a great province in the west, all nationalities and all classes must work hand in hand; that Protestants and Catholics, English, French, and German, and all other classes must work together for the common good. That, Sir, can only be accomplished when toleration and sympathy and a respect for the opinions and feelings of others characterize the relations of one class towards the other. In conclusion I may say that the school laws of the Northwest Territories have in the past worked to the entire satisfaction of our people, and I have no hesitation in saying that the school clauses now contained in this Bill have my unqualified approval. Just one word more. It has been asserted over and over again in this debate that the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and the Liberal party have reversed their policy of 1896. I do not think so. What position did the right hon. gentleman take in 1896, and what did he say to the people of Manitoba and to the people of this country? He said: Here is the school law of Manitoba, it was framed by the Manitoba government, it was approved by the Manitoba legislature and endorsed by the Manitoba people; I will not force the people of Manitoba to adopt any other school law than the one approved

Mr. LAMONT.

of by her own people through her own legislature. And what does the right hon. gentleman say to the people of the new provinces and the people of Canada to-day. He says: Here is the school law of the Northwest Territories, it was framed by the Northwest government, it was approved by the Northwest legislature and endorsed by the Northwest people; I will not force the Northwest people to adopt any other school law than the one approved of by her own people through her own legislature. To my mind the principle followed in both cases is the same. The right hon. gentleman was right in 1896 when he took this position against the Remedial Bill. The right hon. gentleman is right to-day in the position he now takes on this Bill. That the right hon. gentleman was right in 1896 the people of this country have declared in a most emphatic manner on three successive occasions. That the right hon. gentleman is right to-day, the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta will likewise emphatically declare whenever he desires to appeal to them for an expression of opinion.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). I wish to make a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lamont) was in error when he suggested I made a misstatement when I said that the draft Bill laid before the legislative assembly in 1902 by Mr. Haultain was unanimously endorsed by them. I certainly used words to that effect, but I went on to explain that there was a dissenting voice at the time. The hon. gentleman from Prince Albert quoted the resolution offered by Mr. Haultain—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman to be making a personal explanation arising out of the debate and I think he is in order.

Mr. LAKE. I was accused of making a misstatement and I wish to put that right. I shall do so in as few words as possible. The hon. gentleman quoted the resolution in general terms offered by Mr. Haultain, and that resolution simply endorsed the demand for autonomy. He quoted that as a proof that the assembly did not endorse the draft Bill. There were other resolutions offered later on in that House. The draft Bill was not endorsed by a specific vote of the legislature and I never said so. But the gentleman who generally spoke for the opposition in the legislative assembly, Mr. Bennett, introduced the following resolution:

Therefore be it resolved that the establishment of provincial institutions in the Territories is urgently and imperatively required, and that apart entirely from the question as to whether one or more provinces should be established. This house approves of the claims and demands made by the territorial government in that behalf in the memorandum submitted to the Dominion government on the 7th December, 1901.