

told us in so many words that Mr. Haultain had no right or reason to complain of the opportunity given him to discuss the educational clauses in the Bill. When we look at Mr. Haultain's letter and find that he states that he never saw these clauses until noon of the day on which the Bill was introduced, that he never heard of these clauses until the previous Friday when there was but a casual reference to them—and evidently the clauses themselves could not have been laid before him—we have an idea of the importance the right hon. gentleman attaches to the opinion of the Northwest Territories when it applies to the educational clauses of these important Acts. When a most important question touching the province of Manitoba was presented to the right hon. gentleman, when the legislature of Manitoba and the people of Manitoba were a unit in desiring that their province should be extended to the west, when it was an undeniable fact that a little province 73,000 square miles in size, of which 10,000 miles were under water, was to be placed side by side with two gigantic provinces of a quarter of a million square miles each, when the legislature of Manitoba and the people of that province pleaded that their province might be placed on an equal footing with these new provinces, the one sufficient answer that the right hon. gentleman gave was why the people of the Northwest Territories through their legislature have opposed such a claim. And inasmuch as the people of the west have opposed it the request of Manitoba was promptly denied. Why is it that the people of the Northwest Territories and the premier of the Northwest Territories have so extraordinary an influence on the right hon. gentleman and his government in regard to some matters, and that their opinions have so little value in regard to the educational clauses which if passed must bind these provinces for all time to come, through all eternity. The right hon. gentleman thought the matter was of so little importance that to-day, after the country has been convulsed for more than a month he congratulates himself and gravely tells us that Mr. Haultain had ample opportunity to discuss these clauses which he never saw. I am sorry, Sir, that a case such as this, without precedent one might say, leads to peculiar complications, and so I am not perfectly certain that I agree with my leader in one statement that he made. That hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that the seven members from the west were those who enlightened, instructed and controlled the premier in this legislation. Possibly they did, Sir, on the principle of the doctrine of exclusion. We know that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did not; we know that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) did not, and we know that the premier, representing the people of the Northwest Territories did not, and I suppose that the hon. gentleman

who leads this side of the House, (Mr. R. L. Borden), must have concluded that the seven gentlemen in question were the ones who really did guide the premier, basing his opinion on the kind of advice they gave on statements of the right hon. gentleman as made before the House when the Bill was introduced. The hon. gentleman who leads the opposition may be right, but I decline to think that any native-born Canadian could have given the right hon. gentleman such advice as he evidently received. I think that no one who reads the statement which he made when the Bill was introduced, and I say it with all respect to the right hon. gentleman, because I quite understand that the onerous duties of the leader of a government, especially when the session is in progress—can doubt that the right hon. gentleman has no time to devote to the acquisition of facts of law and otherwise, and therefore he is dependent on some one for these facts. It would seem that the gentleman who instructed him relied on imagination for his history and his invention for his law, and I think we are justified in considering that even these seven were not consulted. The question as to the propriety or impropriety of the clauses is of course not a question which we can discuss at the present time.

But surely all must admit that the very evidence we have seen in this House day after day, when, from one end of this country to the other petitions are pouring in, some for and some against this measure, must be enough to impress the members of this House with the gravity of the position in which the right hon. gentleman placed this House, has placed these provinces, has placed the people of Canada by introducing the Bill which has been so long held back. And the right hon. gentleman seems to lead us to infer that the Bill was held back out of kindness and consideration for the wishes of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Applying the old rule that it is the unexpected that happens, we would naturally expect the right hon. gentleman to defer his own wishes to the convenience and interest of the hon. member for East Grey. But, as I understand the complaints made by the hon. member for East Grey and other gentlemen on this side of the House, they are not that the right hon. gentleman has held back the second reading of the Bill so much as that we cannot find out what the Bill is. I think the hon. member for East Grey was right in asking that ample time should be given to the country to consider and digest the provisions of the Bill. But how is the country to consider and digest these most important matters when the right hon. Prime Minister will not tell us, though appealed to again and again, what the provisions of the Bill are to be. It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to tell us that no important Bill