

Robinette animated by a desire to see his own party defeated and replaced by a Conservative administration? And what about Mr. Willison, the biographer of the leader of the government, his strong admirer and life long friend? Is he taking the public platform against this measure simply because he is animated by a sudden zeal in the interests of the Conservative party? Is Mr. Thomson, King's Counsel, also taking the platform in the interests of the Conservative party? And Mayor Urquhart and all those other gentlemen who are members of the Liberal party—are they animated by a like motive? Oh, but say some hon. gentlemen opposite, they have been misled. These intelligent gentlemen, equally as intelligent as any to be found in the Liberal ranks, just as intelligent as the hon. member for Edmonton and the hon. member for Ottawa and the hon. member for West Assiniboia—these gentlemen we are told have been misled. But surely they will not accuse the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with having been misled when he got up and denounced this Bill. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that he spoke too soon but he none the less denounced the measure, and he has always given faithful support to this government ever since 1896, when he first entered the House. Surely he is not to be called a renegade Liberal or even a man who has been misled. Again look at the Laurier Club, composed of some of the brightest minds in the city of Toronto, which passed resolutions condemning this measure. Are we to be told that that club was animated by a desire to benefit the Conservative party? Then we have the Indian Head Liberal Association passing a resolution which was read here the other evening by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in which they condemn, not the original clause, but the amended clauses. The resolution reads as follows:

We, the members of the Indian Head Liberal Association desire to enter a protest against the educational clause in the Autonomy Bill, believing that such is an interference with provincial rights. The clause, as amended by the compromise Bill now before parliament, does not in our opinion contain any modification of what we believe to be an infringement of our rights as a province, and for this reason we emphatically protest against the Bill as recommended.

Copies of this were sent to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Hon. Clifford Sifton and R. S. Lake, M.P.. This association is composed of gentlemen who live in the constituency of Mr. Bulley, a member of the territorial executive. All the ministerial associations in almost every province in the Dominion have been heard and they are all in the same language, and many of these who signed the petitions and signified their protests, never gave a Conservative vote in their lives. Still they are out doing what they believe to be in the best interests of

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

education and of the western people. Was the legislature of British Columbia also animated in the interests of the Conservative party when they passed a resolution the other day unanimously condemning the Bill, and asking that educational affairs be left entirely to the new provinces? I do not know whether the members from British Columbia in this House are going to be guided by this expression of opinion, but I do know that in the local legislature of British Columbia the parties are almost equally divided, the government having only three or four of a majority. And this resolution passed that House unanimously and without a single adverse criticism:—

This House regrets that in the Bill submitted to the Dominion parliament granting autonomy to the Northwest Territories there is an interference with provincial rights in regard to the provisions dealing with their school question.

The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) states that there is a vast difference between the amendment and the original clause. As a layman I fail to see the difference. Those schools are to be maintained, under either clause, in much the same way. The original clause stipulated that all the moneys appropriated by the legislature and distributed as the proceeds of all sales of school lands shall be distributed in an equitable manner between the separate and the public schools.

The amended clause reads that all the funds arising for school purposes—which includes the proceeds of the Dominion lands and all appropriated by the legislature—shall be distributed without discrimination, that is, shall be distributed in an equitable manner. It is simply a change of the wording without any change of the meaning, so far as I can see, and so far as many other hon. gentlemen, much more conversant with the meaning of legal phraseology than I am, can see. But if the ex-Minister of the Interior takes that view, what view have they in the province of Quebec, as shown by some of their leading party journals? I will read from 'Le Canada' of a couple of weeks ago an article in which great credit is taken for the Prime Minister for standing to his guns and not compromising, but insisting upon obtaining for their people exactly what he sought to get in the first place:

In virtue of the Laurier law, the minority will conserve:

1. The separate schools.
2. Religious instruction.
3. Its share of the taxes.

In addition the minority will have the benefit of section 93 of the British North America Act. The organic law of 1875 contained no such protection, and in truth, a guarantee of a system of separate schools without the insertion of section 93 is illusory. If in the future the legislature should pass a spoiliatory law, abolishing the rights of the minority, the minority will have these powers:

1. An appeal to the courts.