

said that the Northwest Territories were quite able to look after their own religious matters without any interference from the outside. If only this Nestor had been present with his advice in 1905, and that advice had been taken, to the harmony and the beautiful prospect of the natal day there would have succeeded none of the blackness and strife and trouble which followed. But, Sir, from the very first the auspices were cast sinister. In the election which preceded the granting of a charter to those provinces, the matter was kept as much as possible a profound secret, so that the people of those territories themselves had no opportunity of making their voice and their wishes known in that respect. Members were elected to this House on issues entirely different and foreign from that issue. That of itself was a wrong beginning. It would have been far better if the administration had been open and above board with the people of those provinces and have conferred with them before they made their choice of representatives at the polls. But they did not take that course. They allowed the people to vote in ignorance of what took place immediately afterwards. The charter was concocted secretly and sprung upon this House in the absence of the responsible minister. It was received in rebellion. Revolution broke out. One minister resigned. Others came to the very verge of resignation, and there was wild dismay in the camp. Why? Simply because the measure brought down, and intended to be forced through, surprised alike the representatives and the people of that province. Much has been said with reference to the disposition of Mr. Haultain and his course regarding that matter. The right hon. the First Minister attempted to-day to justify the course of the administration and the course of the lieutenant governor in passing over Mr. Haultain and choosing some other person. The minister's apology and defence was a weak one. Let us investigate it for a moment. Why should Mr. Haultain have been passed over? Was there any more loyal man in the Northwest? Was he at least not as loyal as Mr. Scott? Was he not at least as capable as Mr. Scott? Was he not infinitely more experienced than Mr. Scott? Had he not the trust of his people, evinced in a manner in which it was never evinced towards Mr. Scott? Had he not the latest mandate of the people of the territories? With that mandate he came down to the capital and placed all his resources at the disposal of this government in order to perfect the character of the territories, whose mandate he held and whose representative he was. Himself and his colleague came down together, and together they placed their best information in the hands of the government. At what point was there divergence? Only when violence was attempted to the constitution by the administration at Ottawa.

Then and only then. But was Mr. Haultain the only man to be condemned when he made opposition to that? Were others who opposed it not to be condemned as well? Mr. Scott has been lauded; his judgment has been extolled. Let us take it all as right and just and a reasonable estimate; but let us look at Mr. Scott, as he really felt, and not as we saw him in this House. Almost the very moment that he was making a certain face in this House, after he had gone out from this chamber, he sat down and wrote confidential letters to his friends in Regina, in which he reveals the real situation and the real man. Sidelights are some times very important lights. Let us see what sidelights Mr. Scott throws upon this. Well, Sir, Mr. Scott's opinion of the government is refreshing. He says:

My own opinion on this occasion is that the matter has been bungled almost unpardonably, but I am none the less clear in my own mind as to the proper course to pursue.

Speaking of the separate school situation, he went on to say:

It was impossible to evade the issue. To leave the subject wholly within provincial control was bound to be objected to by Roman Catholics, because they were bound to look then very quickly and see the last vestige of their separate schools disappear. 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.

That is an insight into Mr. Scott's statesmanlike quality of mind. With him the right and justice of a thing is nothing. The point to be considered is will the thank offering of subservient be gained.

In the present case, the hierarchy would have too much reason behind their contention. I don't for a moment think that the case for separate schools is legally or constitutionally binding—

That is a new light from Mr. Scott. When he faced this House, his speech was quite the opposite—'We are standing upon the rock of the constitution.' That is where the Prime Minister stood; and Mr. Scott clambered up beside him. That is where the rest of them stood. But, in his lucid moments, unbosoming himself to his friend, he says: 'I do not for a moment think that the case for separate schools is legally or constitutionally binding.' And he goes on:

—but morally the case is pretty strong, and in my view it would be simply now beyond all reason to expect Laurier to induce Quebec to swallow the third time when the weight of the moral argument was strongly against him.

Right, constitutional right, the truth of the matter, the justice of the case, is not involved—it is a question of swallowing, and of how often a man should swallow and the exact moral question involved which