

it is that the fund shall be distributed to such schools as are by the law entitled to the money.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I would ask the hon. leader of the House if we are to understand that the whole fund has been distributed to the provinces?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The money is invested by the Finance Department, I presume, in securities of the Dominion, and it is paid out from time to time to the provinces.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Capital or interest?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Only the interest. On two or three occasions, I do not know whether under this government or the previous government in the last 20 or 30 years, I know a portion of the principal has been given to the province, I presume, at a time when the province was hard up.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—That was to Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—It is the same principal?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think only in one or two instances has the principal been encroached upon, and that was only a small part.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—By this legislation, is the capital to be paid out, or is it the interest only?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, the capital is invested, and the interest only is paid out.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Legislation was introduced into the Senate asking that \$300,000 of the capital be given to Manitoba. That was passed in the House of Commons, but was thrown out by this House. That was legislation disposing of a part of the capital. Those school lands being sold created a fund, and that fund amounts to a large sum, perhaps a million now.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know; it is increasing largely.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The division we had at that time when that legislation came up, was founded on the rights of the minority. At that time we claimed that the minority

had a right to a certain share and that Roman Catholics of the territories or the provinces were deprived, by the legislation that was brought in at the time, of their fair share of the public monies, because the legislation of that province prevented their having the schools which, under the Act of 1875, they had a right to have, and which they had not. We were speaking of public and separate schools in relation to the Autonomy Bill. Here is what has been said on that question. We remember that Mr. Sifton, when the Autonomy Bill was carried, had left the ministry some weeks previous. In the House of Commons he said:

Then, where there is a public school, the minority, Protestant or Roman Catholic, may organize a separate school; but every separate school is subject absolutely to all the foregoing provisions, and is in every sense of the term a public school.

Mr. Fielding was no less explicit in his expression. What did he say:

From the hour at which these schools open in the morning up to 3.30 in the afternoon they are absolutely alike; there is no difference. The teachers have the same duties, the same qualifications, the same examinations, the same course of study, the same books are prescribed by the government. The regulations are made by the government. I repeat that from the hour of opening in the morning up to 3.30 in the afternoon, there is no shade of difference in all these schools in the Northwest Territories.

What did Sir Wilfrid Laurier say:

Do you not believe that what you call separate schools in this instance are really national schools?

The great objection to separate schools is that it would divide our people, but if the same education is given to what is called separate schools, as in all other schools, I fail to see what objection there is to such a system.

I think that in the face of those declarations, that were made publicly on the floor of the House, nobody will have the slightest hesitation in admitting that in the Northwest the separate schools are identically the same as the public schools. We are told there is a difference. They are all public schools—all schools sustained by the state. That was my contention yesterday, and I always made that contention. We in Quebec are told 'Oh, but the minority in the territories have their separate schools.' Well, that is the kind of separate schools they have. They have separate