

such experience as we have recently had in the west is hardly sufficient to relieve our apprehension, and I assert, Sir, without fear of contradiction, that popular sentiment in the west emphatically condemns any attempt to use government officials for political purposes.

I will give you the names of a few officials who participated in the recent elections in one riding in the last election.

1. Neil G. McCallum, Yorkton, H.I., acted as an agent for Liberal candidate at McKenzie.

2. S. G. McKee, Yorkton, clerk, Dominion Land Ordinance, acted as an agent.

3. John Komainitaky, clerk, interpreter, Dominion Land Ordinance, acted as an agent.

4. Carl Cenik, Winnipeg, Interior Immigration Office, acted as an agent and canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

5. Mr. Wolf, Winnipeg, Immigration Office, acted as an agent, and canvassed for the Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

6. Paul Bredt, Immigration Agent at Regina, resigned and since promoted, addressed meetings and canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

7. C. W. Speers, Central Colonization Agent, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

8. Mr. Halloquist, Scandinavian Interpreter, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

9. Thos. McNutt, acting Immigration Agent, canvassed for Liberal candidate in McKenzie.

Some of these men, homestead inspectors and interpreters were brought all the way from Winnipeg. I merely mention this matter to direct the attention of the First Minister to it. I regret that he is not in his place. The Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), if I remember correctly, stated that a public officer should be *persona grata* to all the people. And the Prime Minister said:

I feel as strongly now in 1903 as I did in 1896 that when a man has taken office under the government he should take no part in politics.

I mention this to the House to ask these hon. gentlemen, in view of the statements I have given as to the British colonial policy, is it sufficient reasons to withhold from these new provinces the right to administer their public domain?

Now, coming to the educational clause, I desire to examine these clauses for a few minutes. Before I proceed to discuss the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) from its merits, I wish to direct my attention to the speech made a few evenings ago by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). He claimed that the clause inserted in Mr. Haultain's draft Bill was identically the same as that of the Bill now before the House, so far as the educational question is concerned. And, for fear of misquoting him, let me give his own words as found at page 3163 of 'Hansard':

But I find that section 3 of this draft Bill, which was prepared by the Northwest government in 1901—and these provisions were re-

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

peated in 1903—is almost word for word with section 2 of the Autonomy Bill which is before the House and as a matter of fact is a reproduction of the similar section in the Act admitting each individual province into the Dominion. It reads:

Now, before this matter could be discussed, or even fairly understood, I presume, it would be necessary to make sure that we realize the difference between 'continue' and 'perpetuate.' Does the hon. member for Edmonton propose that creating new provinces in the Northwest, we should get along without any law at all until the legislature can meet? Surely not. And this section 3 simply preserves for the time being the laws in existence on the 1st of July next. A section similar to this has been put in every law creating a province, simply to provide a body of laws until the legislature can meet and pass laws to continue the laws that have been handed over or repeal or amend them. Yet, the hon. member for Edmonton tries to construe this Bill as simply giving to the people of the Northwest what they asked for in their draft Bill. But I have already indicated the difference—we may have asked for it for the time being; but we do not ask to have the present system of schools perpetuated or the power to repeal the existing system taken away. We have a law with regard to brands. Does the hon. member for Edmonton want to discontinue that and have no law? We have a law with regard to bulls. If there was a law in the Northwest with regard to strikes, no doubt the hon. member for Edmonton would like to have it kept on the statute-book until the legislature could meet and pass such a law. He says also:

I say that in view of the fact that these separate schools have been in existence for 20 years absolutely at the disposal of this parliament, without a word of objection from the legislature of the Northwest Territories—

But I find that on reference to the Journals of the legislative assembly, for 1889, page 65 and for 1890, page 129, that there were certain proceedings of that assembly of which the hon. member for Edmonton did not inform the House. Now I find that the Act of 1875 deals with education, and I am going to trouble the House while I read a few words from one section, as it is necessary for the point I desire to make. Section 14, the much-discussed section says:

14. The Lieutenant Governor in Council shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education but it shall therein always be provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor; and also that the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic may esta-