

out of the proceeds of the sales of the public lands and all other moneys granted for educational purposes. Is this an evidence of the tolerance that the right hon. gentleman spoke about in his introductory speech? Is this all the confidence he has in the people inhabiting the Northwest Territories? What evidence have they ever given that they will not deal justly, and even generously, with minorities in that country? The right hon. gentleman is quite willing to consult their wishes when he thinks those wishes are in accord with his own; but he is not willing to be guided by their desires when they run counter to his own views. He does follow out their wishes when he refuses Manitoba's request for an extension of her boundaries, but he will not be bound by them when they ask for public lands, and he considers it the essence of statesmanship when he refuses them the right to say what their school system shall be, and denies them what the British North America Act evidently intended they should have, namely, the sole control of their educational affairs. If the right hon. gentleman desired an evidence of public sentiment in the Territories on educational matters, if he was in quest of that pillar of cloud by day and that pillar of fire by night to show him the way and to give him the light, to use his own simile, let him look at the history of separate schools in that country, and he will find that, notwithstanding the fact that the Northwest Territories Act was passed in 1875 permitting the establishment of separate schools in that country, there exists to-day but about ten separate schools to nearly 1,100 public schools. What greater evidence could he desire or require as to the public sentiment of that country regarding the character of the school system they desire? And, Sir, what avail is it to resurrect the mouldy speeches of the Hon. George Brown, of the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and of the Hon. Edward Blake, to prove what those gentlemen had in their minds when they incorporated that provision in the Northwest Territories Act, stating that they wished intending immigrants to know what kind of schools they were going to have in that country. When I venture to say that not one man in 5,000 who have gone into that country to make homes for themselves ever asked the question whether there were separate schools there. The only question agitating them was: What educational facilities are there for giving my children a good common school education? A proof of this is found in the fact that, notwithstanding that the Act permitting separate schools has been in existence thirty years, there is a diminishing number of separate schools and a rapidly increasing number of public schools. In face of this experience and of this overwhelming public sentiment in the Northwest, the Prime Minister has incorporated a clause in this Act forcing upon those new provinces a school

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

system that may or may not prove to their liking in the years to come.

Now, the ex-Minister of the Interior has stated that he is personally aware of the fact that people have taken the trouble to secure copies of the ordinance to see if there were separate schools in that country before going to make their homes there, leaving the impression that they would not have gone in there had they not been sure that there were separate schools in existence. If that is the case, I charge the ex-Minister of the Interior with having—whether deliberately or not, I will not say—misled the immigrants through his immigration literature that he has scattered broadcast in almost every civilized country of the globe, among people whom he wished to attract to this country; for I have hunted in vain for one single expression in that literature where there was any reference to a separate school system. On the contrary, as was shown by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), it is distinctly stated in a pamphlet that has been distributed that the schools are non-sectarian, and national in their character—not a word about separate schools. The Minister of Finance stated that on his European tour he was in consultation with a certain representative of a foreign country who was very much agitated about the outcome of this separate school agitation in Canada, and the impression he conveyed to the members of this House was that if there were no separate schools in the Northwest we would have very few immigrants from that country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the speech made by the Minister of Finance the other evening, I think we would all be delighted to hear the character of the reply he made to that representative of a foreign country. I think if the hon. gentleman sends a copy of his speech over to that representative it will convey to that gentleman a vastly different impression from the impression he gave him in the reply which he gave, because I am sure he did not try to convince that representative that they had no separate schools in that country, where as his whole argument here was to convince us that there were practically no separate schools, that they were national schools, and that any difference there is would soon disappear. This policy, in my opinion, cannot be defended on legal grounds. The constitution of our country does not force us to perpetuate this system of schools contrary to the wishes of the people inhabiting that part of the Dominion. It is true that the right hon. leader of the government, when he introduced this Bill, based his sole argument upon the ground that he stood by and on the rock of the constitution, but by the time my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had got through with his speech in criticism of the speech of the