

talking with one of the western Liberal members one day, I expressed my admiration of the Minister of Justice and said what a clever gentleman I thought him to be. This hon. gentleman replied: Yes, he is just a little bit too clever. Perhaps they thought the hon. Minister of Justice, being so clever, would be able to inclose in Autonomy Bill No. 2, certain veiled sentences, certain legal clauses that to the laymen from the prairies of the west looked insignificant, but to the Minister of Justice and the right hon. Prime Minister meant a good deal more than the gentlemen from the west thought they did. I may say that is my opinion of this Bill. I believe it gives all that was intended to be given in Autonomy Bill No. 1, and in conversation with Mr. Haultain, the premier of that western country, that view received confirmation. I must say that I think Mr. Haultain is one of the cleverest men in the Dominion of Canada to-day. There are few men his equal in ability. He says that Autonomy Bill No. 2 gives more than Autonomy Bill No. 1 intended to give, and I notice that in an interview in the Toronto papers, Mr. Haultain carries out that contention. I think he is right. I am a layman. I am not a lawyer and I am glad of it. I am pleased to say that.

An hon. MEMBER. That is something to thank God for.

Mr. LALOR. Yes, I thank God I am not. I am unable to give a legal opinion of the Bill, but I think any layman who will read the Bill, the ordinances and the regulations of the Northwest Territories, must conclude that certain clauses of the first are re-enacted in the second Bill, and that whatever is retained in the second Bill that was in the first Bill is just that much in addition to what was proposed to be given by the first Bill. The original clause in respect to the right to establish separate schools is a re-enactment of the provisions of section 14 of the Northwest Territories Act of 1875 in regard to separate schools. Under the statutes of 1875 there grew up in the Territories a system of separate schools and of dual language entirely conducted by the clergy. The speech of the hon. member for Brandon will prove that assertion. There were separate schools in the most objectionable form. When the kick was made on this section the government introduced the amendment under discussion. The amendment proposed says that nothing in such legislation—meaning Acts of the local legislatures of the new provinces—shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege granted in regard to separate schools in the ordinances 29, 30 and 31, of the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories.

The only section of the ordinance that grants any right or privilege is section 41 of chapter 29, and that section grants the right and privilege of establishing separate

schools in the same identical language as section 14 of the statute of 1875. The result is that the original Bill re-enacts a part of section 14 of the statute of 1875, and the amendment proposed does not change it, because it provides that section 41 of the ordinance, chapter 29 which is identical with the language of section 14 of the statute of 1875, shall not be interfered with. It is only a play on words; all the provisions of the ordinances are simply matters of regulation and do not grant a right or privilege and so are not incorporated in the Act as amended. Now then, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I claim that the second Bill gives all that it is contended would have been given in the first place. I have heard this discussed from day to day in this House, and I have never yet heard the Minister of Justice stand up to say that such is not the case. For my part I would like very much to see the Minister of Justice stand up in this House and tell us if the second Bill simply means the one half hour's teaching in these schools in the west. I would like to hear him give it that interpretation if it be correct, but I doubt very much that he will do so. We were told by the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) in his speech, that this Autonomy Bill was never intended to give to the Northwest provinces anything more than they have now in the matter of education, and he said that it was the fault of the draughtsman who drew that Bill that it included, as the hon. gentleman said, the greatest church endowments that ever were given in the world. It was the fault of the draughtsman, he said, that a share of \$50,000,000 worth of public school lands were given to these separate schools which were to have all the characteristics of church schools. Well, the Minister of Justice has since admitted that he was the draughtsman, so that I presume he must be the man to take the blame. But what I want to know is, who it was that the member for Brandon meant when he stated in this House that the draughtsman was to blame. I have in my own mind who it is that he did mean. I believe that the member for Brandon meant a certain dignitary who is in this country now, and I want to state here that I will not say one word that could be in any way called a reflection upon that gentleman who is the respected and honoured head of a great church in this country. When I get through with my address I trust, Sir, that no one will be able to state that I have said an unkindly word of the Roman Catholic church or of the Roman Catholic people of this country whom I respect. That is not my desire, and in mentioning the name of the Papal ablegate, I do so, not with any disrespect, but simply to show what the member for Brandon meant when he referred to the draughtsman of this clause. I have proof here that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) did not make that assertion for the first time, and that it was