

of public schools and separate schools. Now what does this Bill propose to do? The Bill as originally introduced, and indeed as it is at present, proposes to devote these funds in equal proportions—at any rate without discrimination—to the separate schools as well as to the public schools established in that country. It proposes to divert the fund that is provided for the support of public schools from its legitimate channel and to apply it to a purpose for which it never was designed. I need not say that the original Bill met with the very strongest opposition in this House and in the country, and even within the ranks of the government itself. It was opposed on all sides; the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when he learned the contents of the Bill at once entered his protest and he refused to sit around the council table with the men who had concocted such a measure. Then, the next step was the introduction of the new clause which was supposed to remove all the objectionable features of the original clause 16, and this was the clause which brought back Mr. Sifton to the support of the government. I want for a few moments to look at the difference between these two clauses; I think it is proper that we should analyse them. Immediately that this new clause was published the report was sent broadcast throughout the country that the difficulty had been removed by giving to the Northwest Territories simply what they enjoy at the present time. I think that hon. members in discussing this question have largely avoided analysing the difference between the original and the amended clause, and have endeavoured to conceal the fact that the difference in principle practically amounts to nothing at all. The original clause 16, provided for the establishment of a dual system of schools; it provided that the money set apart under the Dominion Land's Act for the support of public schools should be diverted and appropriated without discrimination for the support of public and separate schools. We are all agreed that this was the meaning of the original clause, and we are all further agreed that it took away from the people of these new provinces the freedom to administer their educational affairs as they might consider best in their own interests. It deprived them of what they were entitled to as a freedom loving people, namely the right of self-government in the matter of education. These, Sir, are the three cardinal principles of clause 16 of the original Bill. Now what do we find in the amended clause? In the first place the amended clause provides for a dual system of schools exactly as the original clause did; the amended clause provides that the money set apart under the Dominion Land's Act for the support of public schools shall be diverted and appropriated for the support of public and separate schools without dis-

Mr. HENDERSON.

crimination; and lastly the amended clause provides that the right of self-government, the right to administer their school affairs shall be withheld from the new provinces. I ask my hon. friends on the other side of the House if they can see any difference between the original clause and the amended clause? If they can see a difference, I cannot. In principle there is no difference whatever, but it pleased the Minister of the Interior to go out on the one clause and to come back on the other. Like a man going on a journey, he bought a return ticket because he intended coming back by the same route. I have on doubt that in starting the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) thought there were boulders on the track; he thought the engine might bump into a landslide or something of that kind, and it was not a very pleasant journey for him. But when he came back over the same road he found there were curvatures and other obstructions that he did not anticipate, and he found he had to make a pretty sharp curve in order to get back. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) is a man of great resource. He says he does not like this legislation at all, and let me read his words just to see how badly he does like it. In his speech the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) said:

I hesitate to vote; I find great difficulty in bringing myself to vote for subsection 1.

Yes, but he is going to vote against his conscience:

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying what my own opinion would be. It would be that the province ought to be left entirely free to deal with its own educational affairs.

Is it any wonder that he finds hesitation in voting for subsection 1 of the amended Bill when he is voting against his own conscience, when he is voting against his own convictions, when he is voting contrary to his opinion, as he tells us a great many members on the Liberal side of the House are going to do. And further, Mr. Sifton said:

Although I am for my part convinced, after the history of the question in the province of Manitoba and from knowledge I have of what public men are prepared to think on this whole question from beginning to end, I am firmly convinced that it would be better for the Roman Catholic people of the Northwest Territories if the legislature were left absolutely free.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) tells us that it would not only be better for the Protestants but better for Roman Catholics that the people of that country should be left absolutely free to deal with education as they thought best. Why, Sir, he ought to be on this side of the House. That is what we think. He thinks with us but he votes against us. And why does he do so?