

term which expresses so well what I mean. I wish to refer to another point. The territorial government have to-day the power to do away with the trustees and take control of the schools. In that case what will be the religious instruction? If the trustees are done away with and a commissioner appointed by the legislature in their place, who will direct the education to be given, the curriculum and everything else, how will this clause act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Just as it has done the last twelve years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be true of every clause, and you might as well petrify them all.

Mr. SPROULE. If the trustees, to whom are given the right to say what religious instruction shall be provided, are removed, and a commissioner, who is the representative of the local government, is put in their place, he will have that right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

An hon. MEMBER. You ought to be satisfied with that.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not allow local government to control the trustees, but you do allow them to control the commissioners. The whole thing is an attack on the public schools, and is intended, as far as possible, to do away with them.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend takes a very distorted view of this amendment. The hon. the leader of the opposition this afternoon gave us a ten minute dissertation on the impossibility of having absolutely correct drafting, and what he said was very true. We have an illustration of it here. After about four or five months discussion, we from the Territories think we are now getting a provision in our constitution with regard to education which is exactly what we asked for in the first instance. There are seven members from the Territories behind the government. There has been considerable discussion in the House and in North Oxford and London regarding the origin of the educational clause in this autonomy Bill. The very point brought up by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) this evening is the very best proof of the fact that the issue in North Oxford and London was not the actual effect of the educational clause, it was not the separate or the public school system, but it was whether it was the representative of the Pope or not who drafted that clause and put it in the hands of the First Minister. If the amendment of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) be adopted, we will be getting what the seven members from the Territories, who consulted with the Prime Minister and his colleagues for weeks prior to the 21st February, suggested should be given; and

whether that may suit the representative of the Pope or the hierarchy or the people in the other provinces or not is a matter of comparative indifference to us provided the Northwest people are satisfied with it. And notwithstanding all the efforts made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and others behind and around him, in and out of the House, they have failed to find any element of dissatisfaction in any part of the Territories with regard to this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that they were satisfied with clause 16, No. 1, and clause 16, No. 2, and yet now they say they require to have this amendment in order to get what they wanted.

Mr. SCOTT. When the Bill was first introduced, the people of the Northwest believed it was securing to them a continuation of the system they now enjoy.

Mr. LALOR. Then you admit you were deceived?

Mr. SCOTT. We were not very much deceived with regard to what would happen in North Oxford and London and what might happen in Edmonton. Not much deceived as to what might happen in Lévis.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) was evidently badly scared as to what might happen if they opened Western Assiniboia.

Mr. SCOTT. But I repeat that when this Bill was introduced on February 21, the people expressed no dissatisfaction. When the amendment was announced a month later, they again believed that the object of section 16, No. 2, was to perpetuate exactly what already exists. And so they expressed no dissatisfaction. Notwithstanding all their efforts to obtain such expressions of dissatisfaction, the hon. gentlemen opposite have lamentably failed to secure these expressions. But we find—and the point is made abundantly clear by the discussions of the amendments of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron)—that section 16, No. 2, does not perpetuate exactly and entirely what exists in the Northwest Territories with respect to separate schools and religious teaching. Therefore the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) has proposed a further amendment which will result in doing what we have asked should be done from the very beginning. Hon. gentlemen opposite are too prone—especially the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to look at one section of the people only. They cannot get away from the Roman Catholics of the Northwest. But these are not the only people who are interested in religious instruction in the schools. About a month ago the country