

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective Governments of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union, and on address from the houses of the parliament of Canada to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory, or either of them, into the union, on such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act; and the provisions of any Order in Council in that behalf shall have effect as if they had been enacted by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Moreover, what were the terms of the address that was voted by the federal parliament on the 12th of December, 1867, to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories? I will just read the two paragraphs which are of interest:

That the welfare of a sparse and widely scattered population of British subjects of European origin, already inhabiting these remote and unorganized Territories would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions—

—and I ask the House to weigh these words:

—bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which exist in the several provinces of this Dominion.

That we do therefore most humbly pray, that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased, by and with the advice of Your Most Honourable Privy Council to unite Rupert's Land and the Northwestern Territory with this Dominion, and to grant to the parliament of Canada authority to legislate for their future welfare and good government; and we most humbly beg to express to Your Majesty that we are willing to assume the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these Territories.

What were the terms of the Order in Council of the 23rd of June, 1870, in reply to this address?

It is hereby ordered and declared by Her Majesty, &c. . . that from and after the 15th day of July, 1870, the said Northwestern Territory shall be admitted into and become part of the Dominion of Canada upon terms and conditions set forth in the first hereinbefore recited address, and that the parliament of Canada shall from the day aforesaid have full power and authority to legislate—

For the provisional welfare? No, Sir;

—for the future welfare and good government of the said Territory.

Mr. Haultain's contention is that the powers exercised under that Order in Council were provisional, and that the moment we pass this legislation those powers are wiped out and the educational provisions of the law of 1875 are abolished in the Northwest, because, he says, you could only give pro-

Mr. BOURASSA.

visional powers, and the moment you create provincial government, the new provinces must have the same powers.

Now, the history of the legislation of 1875 has been given in this debate. The origin of that Act, which was introduced by Mr. Mackenzie at Mr. Blake's request, was stated in the debates of those days. Was it enacted that separate schools should exist in the Northwest Territories only for the time that they should be under our care and supervision? Was it only a provisional disposition? No. Mr. Blake stated that we should avoid introducing into that new country the religious disputes that had existed in the other provinces, because the parliament of Canada wanted to invite Roman Catholics to settle in the Northwest Territories as freely as any other class of people. Was it hinted that the Roman Catholic who went there to settle would have the liberty of education, as long as the provisional government existed, but that the moment this parliament, which had given its pledge of honour that that liberty should exist for all time to come, formed a provincial government, that government would be free to wipe out this privilege? After a man had tilled the soil for twenty-five or thirty years in the hope that his children would reap the benefit of his labour and have the same liberty that he had enjoyed, was it intended that the federal parliament should then say to him: 'You shall have your liberty no longer' and leave him at the mercy of the majority which has given evidence that it would not permit him to have that freedom? I say that if this parliament acted in good faith in 1875—and I do not want to presume that Mr. Blake, Mr. Mackenzie, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell were men who did not act in good faith towards the people who would settle there—we are bound in honour, whatever may be the text of the law or the arguments of quibblers—if we are not bound by a sheet of paper, we are bound by the honour of this parliament, and by the memory of the men who made confederation—men like Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Alexander Campbell—to be true to the pledge they gave and to prove that those statesmen were not perjurers.

But how is it that Mr. Haultain and the leader of the opposition, with their great care for provincial rights, have not a word to say against the maintenance of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which was passed by this parliament? Where are provincial rights in that case? Where is the theory of Mr. Haultain, that everything we did before this was provisional, and that we cannot restrict the new provinces? Mr. Haultain, the leader of the opposition and the