

to which I wish to refer in regard to the insinuation that Mr. Haultain does not represent the views of the people of the Northwest Territories, nor the views of the Territorial government. The hon. the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) has seen fit to state that the letter signed by Mr. Haultain was not assented to by his colleague, Mr. Bulyea, and that therefore it did not represent the views of the Territorial government. Now, I assume that the same reason would apply if we should say that this Bill was introduced by the right hon. First Minister without the consent of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Let me ask the Solicitor General to point out one fact of one protest in that letter signed by Mr. Haultain, that is not borne out by the draft of the Bill which he submitted to this House in December, 1901, and to which the legislative assembly at Regina had given their approval. That was their mandate, that was their case; and until the hon. gentleman can point to something in that letter which is not borne out by that draft Bill, then I would consider that the insinuation is not worthy of any further reply. If the hon. gentleman is looking for some members of the Territorial government who have been false to their trust, he certainly cannot point his finger to Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain needs no recommendation in the west, nor does he in Ottawa. He has been dealing with the federal government, and it is in your judgment as to how he has laboured to secure the rights of the people of the west.

Now, Sir, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Solicitor General revive the old contention that the federal government had purchased the Northwest Territories. We are advised to-day that we were not only purchased for the general benefit of Canada, but also that we were discovered by a French Canadian. I think if he will look into the records he will find that that argument was abandoned many years ago. In 1885 the strongest position this government would take was that they had a large pecuniary interest in that country, and that is the position they did take. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to answer a couple of questions in regard to the purchase to which he has referred. Let me ask him to explain to this House when the Bill comes up for discussion of the clauses *seriatim* in committee, if that money was paid as the purchase price of these lands, why was not the deed of surrender made to the people who paid the money? Again, let him explain why, if this land was purchased for the general benefit of the Dominion and to be held for the benefit of the Dominion, a large part of that land was included in the area handed over to the province of Quebec in the year 1898? All we desire in this matter is to be treated as our other fellow-citizens are treated throughout the Dominion of

Canada. Let me also say in passing that the Solicitor General can produce no document which will show that £300,000 were paid as a purchase price for the land. That money was paid to get rid of a trading monopoly, and, as he says, it has been a very bad investment. But I would like to direct him to the debate of 1839, where he will see that the increase in customs and excise duties more than doubled the amount of interest on this £300,000 that was paid for the release of the land. I would also point out that the purchase of these rights opened a field for the trade of eastern manufacturers which has been worth ten times, or a hundred times, the money that has been paid for it. Now, he seems to think that this administration has some claim or title upon that land because they have expended a certain sum of money upon it. He says that it has cost us a couple of rebellions, and that we have been obliged to keep up the mounted police. Well, on the same reason I assume that the Dominion own part of the province of Ontario for the cost of the battle of Queenston Heights.

Sir, I regret that this government has seen fit to place restrictions upon the educational freedom of the new provinces. I do not fail to realize the importance of that question, I do not desire to belittle it for one moment. But I regret that this discussion should take place at this particular time, when our boundaries are being fixed, when our political status is being determined, questions of the most vital importance to us that are liable to be lost sight of in the excitement of this racial and religious question. As representing a western constituency, I do not relish being ushered into confederation under such circumstances, circumstances that have been created by this government without any demand, without any complaint, and without any doubt expressed by the minority in that country in the spirit of fairness of the local government when they come to deal with this question of education. I speak of course subject to correction. The right hon. the First Minister, when introducing this Bill referred to certain threatening letters; perhaps if these letters were produced we would see where this agitation originated. Now, I do not intend to go into this educational question at any length. I have had occasion to observe that it is likely to receive very careful nursing from hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House. I intend, however, to deal with it before I take my seat.

I desire particularly at this time to direct the attention of the House to some features in this Bill which are liable to be lost sight of in the excitement which surrounds the discussion of the educational question. First of all let me refer to a statement made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) a few evenings ago. To my mind it