

putation, because, in the last paragraph of his letter, he speaks as follows :

In concluding this letter I beg to express, on behalf of the Northwest government, our high appreciation of the attentive and courteous consideration extended to us by yourself and the other members of the sub-committee of council throughout the whole conference.

I could not conceive it possible for Mr. Haultain to complain that the questions before us had not been properly treated, when, at the same time, he says he has been shown every possible consideration. It would have been showing Mr. Haultain very poor courtesy indeed simply to ask him to sit at the table of conference and give him no information whatever. But I will take the statement of Mr. Haultain. My hon. friend read it a moment ago ; I will take the liberty of reading it again, so that the House may appreciate whether there has been any fault on my part or on the part of my colleagues on the sub-committee, or whether Mr. Haultain is making a case which, as I have said, it would have been better for him not to have attempted. Mr. Haultain says :

I must take strong exception to the way in which the subject of education has been treated, both in the conferences and in the Bills. I must remind you of the fact that your proposition was not laid before my colleague or myself until noon of the day upon which you introduced the Bill. Up to that time the question had not received any attention beyond a casual reference to it from the previous Friday, and I certainly believed that we should have an opportunity of discussing your proposals before twelve o'clock on the day the Bills received their first reading.

So it appears, according to this testimony of Mr. Haultain, that this matter was considered twice by the conference—on the Friday previous to the 21st of February, and again on the 21st of February. Now, Sir, I do not propose, like Mr. Haultain, to go into the particulars of what took place there, but I will take his own language. True it is that we differed on several matters with Mr. Haultain. True it is, as he says, that we differed with him on the land question. Mr. Haultain was of opinion that the land should be given to the provinces. We thought, on the contrary, that the land should be kept in the hands of the Dominion government. I have already given the reasons for that, and I think those reasons, when they come to be discussed, will stand good in the judgment of every one. Mr. Haultain differed with us also in regard to the subject of irrigation. We thought that subject should go to those who have the management of the land, because the two are intimately connected. Mr. Haultain refers to the fact that we proposed to establish two provinces instead of one. We differed from Mr. Haultain on this point also. We thought it would be preferable to have two provinces in that vast domain ;

Mr. Haultain thought it would be better to have only one province. But I appeal to the judgment of my hon. friend who has taken us to task because we have not adopted the ways and means of Mr. Haultain, and I ask him if he is prepared to say that there shall be one province in that immense territory instead of two—that we should create there one province which would have almost twice the area of the largest province of the Dominion. Whatever may be the views of Mr. Haultain on this subject, the government came to a different conclusion, and our action in this regard, as on everything else, is in the judgment of the House.

But now I come to the principal point made by Mr. Haultain—that the education clauses did not receive fair consideration. As Mr. Haultain says, this question was debated on the Friday previous to the 21st of February. Mr. Haultain calls this a casual consideration only. Well, Sir, this is the result of having no record of what took place. What may have been casual to Mr. Haultain may have been thorough to somebody else ; what may have been only passing to him, may have been sufficient for somebody else. On this I have only to say that the discussions which took place on the 21st of February between Mr. Haultain and members of Council there revealed this fact, that while he held one view, we held another, with regard to the educational clauses. As Mr. Haultain has laid down his views in his memorandum, I shall not commit any breach of privacy if I say what his views were. Mr. Haultain took the ground that section 93 of the British North America Act applied mechanically to those new provinces. The ground we took was that section 93 of the British North America Act did not apply mechanically, but that it should be made to apply in the legislation we offered to the House, subject only to such modifications as the circumstances of the new provinces would warrant. That was, therefore, a distinct difference of opinion between us and Mr. Haultain. The Bills before the House indicate what our position was. The letter of Mr. Haultain speaks of the views he laid before the committee of Council. Those views were that section 93 of the British North America Act applied mechanically to those provinces, and that there was, therefore, no necessity of going beyond section 2 of the Bill. But we said : No ; we agree with you that section 93 must go into this Bill, but we think it should be done legislatively, subject to such modifications as are called for by the present condition of the people. There was the subject of difference. Therefore, we knew exactly what our position was and what the position of Mr. Haultain was. Although we might have discussed the question for a month or a year, there would have been the same difference. We knew exactly the line of cleavage between us and him. We said to Mr. Haultain : We do not agree with you : perhaps you are right, perhaps