

people of the Northwest would have had just such schools as they will have to-day, with all the rights and privileges attaching to those schools as they are to-day. Will the hon. gentleman say that is not the case under the present Act? Would he pretend to say that under the Act now before the House minorities in the Northwest have not exactly the same rights and privileges they would have had under the original clause, except that he suggests that they might in some occult way be put back to the day of 1875 when the hierarchy were controlling the schools? Then the hon. gentleman's reference to the university was rather an amusing one. I am inclined to think that if the hon. gentleman will read the clauses carefully side by side he will find that there is no ground whatever for the objection he raises. Let me read the original clause as it appeared when the Bill was first introduced:

In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education, and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act—

Any moneys appropriated by the legislature for education, or any moneys coming arising from the sale of lands.

There shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools, and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportion.

That is to say, that every dollar applied for schools is to be divided equitably between public and separate schools. But what is there in that clause to suggest that if the legislature choose to endow a university, either the majority or the minority will be discriminated against because in 1910, perhaps, the legislature might give a sum to endow a university? The hon. gentleman had to go very far afield to find such an argument as that to justify his course. When we come to simmer it down—if I am omitting any point I am willing to be corrected—when we come to simmer it down he who, for two or three weeks, has stood on the highest pedestal in the Dominion of Canada, worshipped as a martyr from one end of the country to the other, whose praises could not be drowned even by the rolling waves of the Labrador coast, and which were wafted even to the sunny slopes of the west, that hon. gentleman who has posed for two or three weeks as a conscientious martyr who would lose anything rather than principle, who was prepared to suffer anything except a wound to his conscience—that hon. gentleman comes down to-day and kisses the hand that smote him, and the only possible excuse that he can give for his ingratitude, for his disloyalty to his chief, is that he thought that under this second

Mr. NORTHROP.

clause, if passed, there might possibly come a day when they would endow a university, and there might be a dispute between the majority and the minority as to the distribution of their funds for that university. While under the amended clause there could be no trouble.

Surely, if ever there was a cause to which the old adage *parturiunt montes, nascitur mus*—the mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse—applies, it is this one.

I think I will be justified in saying that when a measure of the importance of this is brought before this House the burden rests entirely on those who proposed it, of showing parliament that the measure of such a character that it is our duty to pass it. It is not part of the duty of the opposition to show that the measure is not a proper one. The burden surely rests on the government of the day, bringing down such an important measure, to show that it is one that should really be passed by this House. The right hon. leader of the government in introducing the Bill—and I am sorry he is not here at the present moment—laid great stress—page 1517 of 'Hansard'—on the fact that we, the people of Canada, occupied a peculiar position, because we have bought and owned these Northwest lands. He declared that we had bought these lands, that we owned them and that we own them now and therefore surely the old saying should hold good: Can a man not do as he likes with his own? I am sorry he is not here, but I see the hon. Minister of Justice in his place, and I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, on behalf of his chief, to tell me from whom Canada bought these lands, when she bought them and how Canada got her title to those lands? When the statement is made, from which inferences are drawn, that we own these lands, I say that the right hon. gentleman should be prepared with some proof to substantiate that statement. I am quite prepared to admit that an hon. gentleman sitting behind him having heard him make the statement that we did own these lands might give his support to the measure which he might not give if he knew we did not own these lands and that we never owned them. If there were any doubt about the question one would only have to look at the state papers at the time the Hudson Bay Company ceded its rights to the Crown. A committee was appointed, composed of Sir George Cartier and Mr. McDougall; they looked thoroughly into the subject and they made a report. Their report was to the effect that the Hudson Bay Company had no title whatever to these lands, that they never did have a title and they gave an abundance of reasons why the Hudson Bay Company never could have had a title. Without occupying the time of the House by going into this simple question I might