

and New York, but it keeps up its Canadian board and when the Grand Trunk Railway goes through Michigan it has to work under its Michigan charter and Michigan directorate. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) said that we were anxious to get American capital and that we should be generous and not put any obstacle in the way. I am quite willing to contrast the liberality extended to Americans investing capital in Canada, with the liberality that the United States extends to Canadians who invest in that country. Look at how they treated the Canadians who went to fight for them during the Civil War; only a few years ago the United States federal government passed a law compelling the pensioners to live in the United States or otherwise they would get no pension. That is not liberality. These men having fought for the union were entitled to the gratitude of the nation, and the treatment accorded to them was not generous. There has been nothing shown so far that would justify us departing in this case from the law we made only a few years ago, and which was intended for a good purpose.

The hour for Private Bills having expired, the Speaker took the chair.

#### PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 2,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. At six o'clock we were discussing the strange lack of compatibility between the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance on this question. As far as we can gather the fact has been established that the intention of the government is to incorporate in the new constitution of Alberta all the rights and all the privileges that the minority had under the Act of 1875. I compliment the Minister of Justice on the wily way he set his web to entrap most of his fellow members. He let them all commit themselves; he allowed the Minister of Finance to say that it was the whittled down proposition that was going into the new law, he allowed the Postmaster General to do the same thing, and he saw unmoved the Minister of the Interior leave the cabinet and take the members from the Northwest out of the party with him as a protest against the original law. What will that lost soul the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) say when he reads the confession made by the Minister of Justice this afternoon? I have heard gentlemen who read the Bill with great care say that the modified clause gives greater rights and privileges than the original clause did to the minority in the North-

west. What have the members from the Northwest to say to the statement of the Minister of Justice, that this modified clause does give to the minority all the rights and privileges they had under the widest reading of the Act of 1875? Having straightened out the Minister of Finance as we did this afternoon and let him see exactly where he stands, we should now straighten out the member for Labelle. He told his audience in Montreal that he was coming to Ottawa to move an amendment which would secure the full rights and privileges of the minority in the Territories, but that is unnecessary, now that we have the assurance of the Minister of Justice that the minority is to have the high water rights and privileges they claim. The member for Labelle owes an apology to the Minister of Justice. The member for Perth (Mr. McIntyre) intended to vote against the government but for some reason or other he did not—probably he was led to believe there was a great difference between the new clause and the old. What has he to say to the statement of the Minister of Justice? The member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) must see that his speech was erroneous, that there is more in the Bill than the half hour of religious instruction, and that he and his fellow members from the west were misled. If they went out before on principle they should go out again on principle. The Minister of Finance has never denied that he threatened to leave the cabinet on account of the character of the original Bill which he thought went too far, and the revelation of this afternoon makes it his bounden duty to go out again. The announcement of the Minister of Justice is not encouraging; it will strengthen the bad feeling that now exists throughout Canada and the reason for opposition to this Bill is doubly strengthened in view of that statement. The government will not be able to justify the Bill before the country, nor will they be able to justify the way they have juggled with this question, and have deceived their own colleagues and their own followers. Those gentlemen who threatened to leave the government on principle now have their eyes opened and they will be doubly stultified if they do not put on record that they have been deceived. I leave the question for the present in order to see how ministers can sit together in view of this revelation, and how these Liberal members opposite can continue to support a government after the confession made by the Minister of Justice as to the real meaning of this amendment.

Section 2 allowed to stand.

On section 4,

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved to substitute for section 4 the following:

4. The said province and the province of Saskatchewan shall, until the termination of the