

friend, but the fact remains that there were people in the province of Ontario who, in last January, before these Bills were brought down, were writing to people in the Northwest Territories; and if I had the file of the Calgary 'Herald' here—which is a Conservative organ—I could read a very strong article advising the people of Ontario to mind their own business and not meddle in this affair of the people of the Territories, who are well able to look after it themselves. But to continue with these communications and resolutions; here is a resolution which was adopted by a public meeting at Moosejaw:

That the school system now in force in the Territories was brought in force by our local legislature and is giving entire satisfaction, and we respectfully urge that the new provinces be given full control of educational affairs.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCOTT. It is evident, on the face of it, that right in that clause there is a misconception. As a matter of fact, this legislation was not brought into existence by the local legislature, but initiated by this parliament. Practically all the protests and communications and complaints which have been raised are based upon misconceptions, though not of so violent a character, I must admit, as those which exist in the mind of the writer of the letter who signed himself 'a lover of freedom.' And a good deal of that misconception exists apparently in the city of Toronto. A gentleman who for many years held, first in Manitoba and then in the Territories, the important position of superintendent of education, spoke at a recent public gathering in Toronto—a gathering held as a protest against the legislation submitted to this House. I refer to Dr. Goggin. I read from the report in the Toronto 'News' that he said:

I take it that we meet here to-night as a body of Liberals, intent upon setting before our party our views on this subject, whether they be right or wrong. That I believe is one of the qualifications of a good party man.

We have all had experience with 'Old Liberal,' 'Disgusted Liberal,' 'Long-standing Liberal,' and various other classes of Liberal who come to the front during a general election or at other periods of excitement. In my own hearing the name of Mark Twain has been used twice in the course of this debate. On one occasion Mr. Clemens, more widely known by his pen-name 'Mark Twain,' was inspecting a group of statuary in the house of a friend. One statue was that of a young woman coiling her hair. The great humorist had a puzzled expression, and, when asked what he thought of the statue he said, 'Well, it isn't true to nature; she ought to have a mouth full of hairpins.' We in the west have been acquainted with Dr. Goggin for many years, but no matter how full of politi-

cal hairpins he was even his best friend would fail to recognize him from this description given of him in the Toronto 'News.' We have always known him as a very estimable, a very genial, but a very thorough-going Conservative. I entirely refuse to believe that Dr. Goggin is correctly reported. I venture to say that the Toronto 'News,' pursuing its very frequent policy of misrepresentation, has incorrectly reported Dr. Goggin, in representing him as belonging to the class of 'Disgusted Liberals.' Dr. Goggin later on referred to Mr. Haultain's draft Bill:

I would like to say a few words in regard to this draft Bill. Certain things are asked for, including provincial control of public lands, but they make no demand for the incorporation of any provisions for separate schools under the new constitution. They do not say one word about it. Nor at the elections did Mr. Haultain say one word about it. No! They trusted to the British North America Act.

I will make some further reference to that later on:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said that he did not think there was much to be accomplished by discussion. We know where Mr. Haultain was, and we know where we were. That is what he said. I might ask, in view of subsequent events, whether he knew where he was or not. One of our objects in coming here to-night is to help him to discover where he ought to be. We know that the people of the Dominion were not consulted; neither were the people of the west. We know that Mr. Haultain and his colleagues were not consulted. We know that neither the Minister of Interior nor the Minister of Finance were consulted. Do you know whether anybody else at Ottawa was consulted? Have you heard whether the Papal Legate was consulted? . . . Are you people of the west to be trampled upon by him? it is as a western man that I appeal to you to-night, and especially to the Liberal party, to let its voice be heard in no uncertain sound.

And we had one of the representatives for Toronto rising in this House one night a week ago, at white-heat of indignation because the Minister of Finance had stated that some religious considerations were being imported into this discussion. Is there no religious suggestion in the statement I have just read, no insinuation calculated to excite the prejudices and passions of the Protestant people of Ontario? Let me say a word with regard to what has been discussed a great deal—'We know that Mr. Haultain and his colleagues were not consulted.' Now Mr. Haultain in his letter has stated that he was consulted in regard to everything except the matter of education.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear—the important one.

Mr. SCOTT. I may remind the hon. member for East Grey that Mr. Haultain came here just after New Years and was here almost continually until the 21st of February when this measure was brought down.