

open for the sectarian or ecclesiastical school.

Mr. LAKE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to state that Mr. Haultain deliberately did that?

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend has listened to me at all carefully, I think there can be no doubt in his mind as to what I have stated. I say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, Mr. Haultain, until that convention two years ago, when he changed from being a non-partisan in local politics to being a partisan all along the line—in fact, down to the time of the last general election in October, 1904—had no intention, as nobody connected with the public affairs of the Northwest had any intention, of asking for any different constitution in regard to schools than that we have had in force for the last fourteen years.

Mr. LAKE. Of course, the hon. gentleman is entitled to his legal opinion as a layman in regard to this question; but I can assure him that Mr. Haultain holds an entirely different opinion from that which the hon. member for Western Assiniboia has expressed in regard to the effect of the draft Bill; and I may say that Mr. Haultain has been responsible for the drafting of the vast majority of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories during the last thirteen years, he being an experienced draughtsman.

Mr. SCOTT. As I have already stated, Mr. Haultain not only apparently neglected, during all the conferences held with the government here, until two or three days before the Bill was presented to the House, to mention the subject of education, but neglected during all the discussions that took place on the subject of autonomy in the Northwest—and there have been discussions of that question for years—to mention the subject of education. He pointed out the advantages that autonomy would give, and the changes it would mean, but never once referred to the matter of schools. I will read to my hon. friend the description which Mr. Haultain himself gave in 1900, in a formal address, of the advantages and changes that would be brought to the Territories by provincial establishment. He said:

But, to put it shortly, in order to show what a very slight difference there is between the powers enjoyed by the Territories to-day, so far as political institutions are concerned, and those which are enjoyed by the provinces, I will state in a few words the exact differences which exist. I need not take the House over a description of the powers which we do enjoy.

The educational power was one we did enjoy, and so he made no mention of it. He went on:

We have nearly all the principal powers a province has. Where we fall short of provincial powers is in these points: We have not the power to amend the constitution outside of the

Mr. SCOTT.

power to deal with certain phases in our election law; we have not the power to borrow money; we have not the power to deal with the public domain; we have not the power to establish certain institutions, such as hospitals, asylums, charities—eleemosynary institutions as they are called in the British North America Act; we have not the power to take cognizance of public undertakings other than such as may be carried on by certain sorts of joint stock companies; and our powers are limited to the extent that we have not the administration of the criminal law in the Territories. That, I think, will suffice for any reference which it is necessary to make to the eighth recital.

Take all the speeches that were ever made by Mr. Haultain, or by anybody else in the Territories, for that matter, and there never was any reference to the question of schools. And if there had been in the mind of any person a desire for more freedom in the matter of education than the Territories already possess, is it not ridiculous to think that, when the cue was given by Mr. Haultain last fall, in the heat of the election, there would not have been some one to present the matter to the candidates, and to seek to obtain an expression from them as to the position they would take on the subject if elected to parliament?

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say earlier in the debate that during the election the question was not brought up or discussed, nor was there any truth in the statement that the government, through Mr. Sifton, had requested the people to trust the government and they would do the best for them. I understand him to say there was no such statement made during the election.

Mr. SCOTT. I say that the question was never presented to me, and I met Mr. Haultain himself twice, once at Medicine Hat and again at Moose Jaw, and he never asked me any question about it. Nobody asked me anything about it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will my hon. friend allow me to refresh his memory? The hon. gentleman lives in Regina. That is in his riding. The Manitoba 'Free Press' of October 20, 1904—during the time the elections were going on—reports Mr. Sifton as having spoken at Regina as follows. After referring to the question of annexation to Manitoba, Mr. Sifton said:

I believe that Haultain has further suggested that I should be asked to state what the policy of the government would be with regard to public schools. I do not believe that Haultain is doing the people of the Territories any service when he makes suggestions of that kind. Any man of ordinary intelligence in public life, and Mr. Haultain is a man of more than ordinary intelligence, knows full well that one member of a government consisting of fourteen members would not come here and without consulting his colleagues, undertake to bind them and the parliament of Canada on questions of such importance. Therefore the suggestion is made in a spirit of mischief. Let