

would create a furore in the Northwest and all over Canada. Why should we depart from the old Act?

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Surely, the province which makes the laws for the schools and distributes the money, ought to be perfectly satisfied.

Hon. Mr. FROST—It is not distributed by the Dominion government.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—These are lands set apart since confederation, and this land and the fund have been held in trust by the different governments of Canada since that time. There is therefore no reason why the provisions of the trust should be disturbed.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They have not been disturbed.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—At the present time all schools separate or public, be they Protestant or Catholic, participate in the funds. The omission of that word will lead to a controversy which will set the fires burning again.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Surely the provinces have a right to distribute the money.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—If I am not mistaken, by the other Act it was provided that the separate schools should have their share

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—And they are getting their share. They are public schools under the Act.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—Under the denomination of public schools.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—They are public schools under the Act, just as much as the Protestant schools.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—They are not denominational schools but public schools.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The explanatory note reads as follows:

Explanatory Note.—This provision is the same as in the present law except that the words 'or territory' have been struck out as the territory referred to has been divided into the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there are no school lands beyond. It is also designed to avoid emphasizing the difference as to educational systems and to bring the section into conformity with the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

That does not refer to it at all. The explanatory note when compared with the clause itself is misleading. There must be some reason for that.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It gives the government a little more latitude. It all goes back for school purposes.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Will my hon. friend say how this government will be justified in diverting that fund, which has been established since confederation, into channels other than that which has been preserved by every statute which has been passed since that time? We have amended this Act time and again since the acquisition of Ruperts Land by the government of Canada, and why at this moment should this be departed from, particularly as Roman Catholic schools as well as Protestant schools are public schools under the Act, and have been participating in the distribution of the funds; but private schools, other denominational schools, other racial schools may be established and may come in under this clause and demand a portion of the fund. I am entirely opposed to any disturbance of the trust which has remained and been protected in all its integrity during those many years.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Does the hon. gentleman not think that the provincial government is the proper party to decide?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—That is not the question. That is a sacred trust which has never been disturbed.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Trust for what? In the province of Manitoba the produce of these lands was given to the provincial government, and it is the same in the other western provinces.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—No. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong. The Northwest country was acquired from the Hudson Bay Company in 1875, Manitoba was then carved out of Ruperts Land, and the rest of the land was put under federal jurisdiction by the law of 1875, and under that law of 1875, the majority in any school or division had the right to have the school they choose, and the minority a separate school; but that was in the point of view of de-