

will be returned to power. We do not suppose the history of any country can show as much good achieved with such inadequate means, and so few mistakes made in the face of great difficulties as have characterized the Northwest government ever since Mr. Haultain has held the helm. The premier once said that if persons wanted to know his policy they would find it in the ordinances. That is true; but it also manifests itself elsewhere. Mr. Haultain may well tell any one seeking his policy to look around. The schools that dot our prairies are the pride of our towns; the public works that are everywhere visible for the use, convenience and profit of the settlers; an up-to-date agricultural department; and the vigilant watch over the Northwest at Ottawa, all speak of a policy which the people of this country ought to be proud of and to this policy has to be added the statesmanlike proposals by which Mr. Haultain has continually urged we should reach the provincial status. Eye has not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of any other man to conceive the good things Mr. Haultain claims as our right in regard to the matter of becoming a province.

Mr. Scott was so strongly in favour of Mr. Haultain then, that he wrote and spoke strongly in his support. To-day, Mr. Haultain maintains exactly the position he took in this Bill of rights of his and for which he received the endorsement of the electors of the west, but Mr. Scott is no longer supporting him. Which do you consider the rank partisan; the man who sticks to his old-time policy, or the man who, because of party feelings has sunk his personal convictions and his past record, and who to-day supports a Bill that gives two provinces instead of one; that does not fix the boundaries as the people of the Territories wished them to be fixed; that refuses the new provinces the ownership of their public domain, and that takes away from these new provinces the control of education. As a usual thing, I do not read copious extracts, but I have on this occasion to borrow the habit from the member for West Assiniboia, because it is only right that the members of this House should have their memory refreshed as to the views held by the hon. gentleman on these questions a short time ago, and which are diametrically opposed to the views which he says he holds to-day. Mr. Scott continues:

No man in Canada has so thorough a grasp of the problem under consideration as Mr. Haultain. Step by step he has brought the Northwest to its present position. Territorial history since 1888—and fourteen years is no short period as political life goes—is his history. For the pressing of the negotiations with and possibly against the federal authorities, we want our strongest and best equipped man. Without doubt Haultain is such a man. He has the facts and the arguments at his finger ends, the subject is now almost part of himself. The people of the west have reason to be proud of their present premier.

Mark you, this is the language of the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) but

a short time ago, and yet the other day we heard him use strong language against Mr. Haultain, simply because Mr. Haultain has seen fit to be consistent.

The people of the Northwest have reason to be proud of their present premier. Under him they have had good and economical and careful government. Largely under his direction a body of laws admirably suitable to new and therefore difficult conditions, have been framed bit by bit and without any violent or disturbing changes. He is fit to stand side by side with any of Canada's public men and ask no odds, as those who heard him in the debate with Premier Roblin at Indian Head last December well know. He is without question the man for the job, which is no light one.

This again is Mr. Scott's language. The other day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) told us that he based his present action very largely on the fact that when the Northwest Territories Act was put through the House in 1875, the Hon. George Brown took a certain position which he proposed to follow. For instance, the hon. member for West Assiniboia said:

And George Brown who did not support the legislation; what did he say?

The moment this Act passed and the Northwest became part of the union, they came under the Union Act, and under the provisions with regard to separate schools.

In the face of that language, if the late Mr. Brown were still alive and had a seat in this House and were confronting the legislation which we have before us, what would he do? Support the protection to minority rights? Certainly. That therefore should I do even if I might be as violent an opponent of separate schools as Mr. Brown was.

It will be noticed that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) speaks out for the rights of the minority. What rights? The rights they secured under the Act of 1875. But these are not the rights the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is contending for, because he says the rights given the minority under the Act of 1875 have been whittled away by the Territorial government so that with one breath he contradicts what he says with another. The hon. gentleman takes the position that George Brown was in favour of these rights that were to be maintained for all time once they were crystallized into law, and he says that he takes the same ground as George Brown, but as a matter of fact the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) is only contending to-day for minority rights which he says are far less than were given to the minority under the Act of 1875. The hon. gentleman for West Assiniboia further says:

I believe—and the large majority of the people in the Northwest Territories that I have heard from since these proposals were brought down also believe—that provincial rights are being granted to them in the fullest sense in which they are enjoyed by any other province of Canada.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) has fallen into another youthful inaccuracy. Can he