

to, if we are to judge them at present by their actions in the past. Mr. Scott in writing to Mr. McInnes giving his reasons why he on behalf of the people of Saskatchewan accepted the school clauses in the Autonomy Bill says:

Laurier had induced Quebec to swallow twice—in 1896 and again in 1899 over the South African business. Neither Manitoba nor Ontario thanked him very emphatically on either occasion.

What he means is that the people of Quebec swallowed the position he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took as against the Remedial Bill which was introduced by the government of which I was at the time the head, and in the other case the people of Quebec, he intimates by this, disapproved of raising the contingent to be sent to South Africa, but in both cases, at the instance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, so says this Premier, they swallowed these objectionable measures. Then he goes on:

In the present case the hierarchy would have too much reason behind their contention. I do not for a moment think that the case for separate schools is legally or constitutionally binding, but morally the case is pretty strong, and in my view it would be simply now beyond all reason to expect Sir Wilfrid Laurier to induce Quebec to swallow a third time—with the weight of the moral argument so strongly against them.

What does that mean? It means that as the Premier induced his friends in Quebec to swallow the views he took on the Remedial Bill and to swallow their convictions against sending a contingent to South Africa, ergo the people of the Northwest must swallow the objections that they had to the school clauses in that Bill. That is the position that they take, or in other words we might ask in the name of common sense, what had one position to do with the other. They virtually say 'you sent contingents to South Africa against our wish—that is the wish of the people of Quebec—therefore to please us you must establish separate schools in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Ontario got its way in regard to the South African war; we must now have our way in regard to separate schools in the Northwest.' Now, that is the position of the Liberal premier in one of the provinces of the Northwest. I am sure my hon. friend who moved this address must regret that himself. No one in the public position he has occupied in the Northwest, taking the active part that he did at the late elections, could by any possibility have overlooked so important a docu-

ment as that emanating from the premier of one of the provinces. There may be a certain satisfaction at the granting of autonomy. My hon. friend who seconded the address says that in travelling through the country one hears very little of the Autonomy Bill. I have heard that before, and believe the statement to be correct. They were too much engrossed with their own prosperity at that time, and they talked of very little else. They were delighted, as His Excellency has said, at having been erected into provinces, and having to a certain extent, all the rights and privileges of the other provinces.

Passing from that, His Excellency rejoices at the bountiful harvest. He speaks of the development of industry, the impetus to exports, the English treaty with Japan and the increase of trade with Britain and foreign countries. The bountiful harvest is what has really contributed to the prosperity of the country, and as the honourable gentleman who moved the address properly said, the prosperity of the west, the filling of the pockets of the people of the west as the result of the bountiful harvest is to us an advantage almost as great as to the people of the west, and for this reason, they are not yet manufacturers; they have to come to the manufacturing centres of the eastern provinces to supply their wants, and we rejoice equally with them that the harvest has been bountiful and their pockets full, because we know that in central Canada and eastern Canada manufacturers will get a portion of the riches which they have acquired by supplying them with the necessaries of life. What His Excellency means when he speaks of the impetus to the export trade, requires explanation. There is no question that in proportion to the production, whether it be of the manufacturers or of the agriculturists, to the extent that we produce beyond what we require for our own consumption will we export; but the exports of the country during the past eight or nine months have been falling off. I do not know that that is any great evidence of a want of prosperity, because as the surplus products of the great Northwest were exported early in the season, in the latter part of the year the exports will necessarily decline. The trade and navigation returns show that the exports have falling off during the last fin-