

sailed, as I say, on more occasions than one. And it was to the late Sir Oliver Mowat, that great advocate of provincial rights, that we in Ontario owe it that the assaults of that enemy were not successful. The Conservative party supporting Sir John Macdonald on these occasions had very little respect for provincial rights. Now, the doctrine of provincial rights is a good doctrine, an excellent doctrine. But it is not a doctrine, to be invoked in defence of the perpetration of a great national wrong. These estimable people in the province of Ontario who are so much concerned at the so-called invasion of provincial rights seem to confine their attention in that respect altogether to the educational clauses of this Bill. They have nothing to say, in their petitions and resolutions sent here to parliament, about the lands; they have nothing to say about the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption. If the government proposals in regard to education be an infraction of provincial rights, how much more so are their proposals in regard to the lands? And yet, do we find these very excellent people complaining or memorializing the government about the land clause of the Bill? Nor do we find them complaining as to the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption. I am of opinion that in future years the matter of that exemption will bear very heavily and very harshly upon the people of the Northwest Territories. But do we find any sympathy expressed by the province of Ontario with these new provinces either on the ground that they will not have their lands, or on the ground of the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption from taxation for all time to come? No sympathy on that score is expressed at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. member not aware of the fact that many petitions have been presented to this House from the people of Ontario praying that the people of these Territories be allowed their land and that there are also petitions from the west expressing regret declaring that they regard that as one of the provincial rights they should enjoy?

Mr. GRANT. I can readily understand the people of the west petitioning to have their lands placed under provincial control; that is a natural thing; but I have been pretty constantly in my place in the House and I do not think that one in 500 of the petitions from the province of Ontario made any mention of the lands at all; they referred only to the educational part of the Autonomy Bill. I say if these excellent, estimable people were sincere in their regard for provincial rights, if they were solicitous for the future welfare of these provinces, they would not confine their attention and solicitude to the educational clauses of these Bills alone but would take up the points I have mentioned. What does that convince me of, Mr. Speaker? I am sorry

to believe it but I must believe that all this commotion and concern is manifested largely because clause 16 of the Bill relates in a measure to the religious convictions of a minority of our people. I am forced to that conclusion and any reasonable man must be forced to that conclusion because there are at least two other great matters that are of paramount concern to the people of the Northwest Territories, that they may have a right to complain of, in reference to which these people in Ontario who are stirring up an agitation are absolutely and entirely silent. It is said that the Liberal party is historically the defender of provincial rights. I am glad to acknowledge that; I heard the hon. member for East Grey say that in his place in the House the other day. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) is quite correct in making that statement and I may say that the Liberal party were defending provincial rights from 1878 to 1890 when my hon. friend was supporting the late Sir John Macdonald in this House in six or seven struggles with regard to provincial rights, but my hon. friend if I mistake not was not on the side of the provinces in these struggles. It is charged that the Liberal party has changed its front with regard to provincial rights, and the leader of that party is also charged with a departure from his record, and it is vehemently charged that the Liberal party is false to its position and to the principles enunciated in connection with the Manitoba school difficulty of 1896. I take issue directly with those who charged the Liberal party with inconsistency, viewing their actions in 1896 in regard to the Manitoba school question and their actions in 1905 in regard to the Bills now under consideration. There is no parallel between the Manitoba school case and the case under discussion. Manitoba, in the exercise of her undoubted powers, altered a school system which she herself had brought into being. I am not saying whether that system was good or bad, I have no expression of opinion to make in that regard, but that system, at least according to the judgment of a great majority of Manitobans, had outlived its usefulness. The late Conservative government sought in the dying hours of a parliament to coerce an unwilling province to return to that abandoned system and we all know the result that followed that attempt. In the present case the Territories adopted their own system of schools and brought it to a state satisfactory to the people of the Territories. The man who cannot see the difference between the case of 1896 and the case of to-day is either wilfully blind or his perceptive faculties are, I think, very very weak.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman made a statement that Manitoba of her undoubted rights adopted a system and afterwards made away with it.

Mr. GRANT. I think that is the state of affairs.