

few years hence animate those new populations which are coming into the Northwest of Canada although we expect, by wise laws, to make them satisfied to live under the flag under which we are so happy to live. Yet, I repeat, in my view it was an act of wisdom on the part of the government and in the best interests of Canada to retain the public lands under the control of this parliament.

With regard to the financial aspect of this measure, I remember hearing my right hon. friend say that it was natural that we should be as generous as possible to those new provinces. I share his view. We are generous. My impression is that the people of the Northwest Territories will be, from a monetary point of view, in a better position, when enjoying their provincial autonomy, than they were ever in before. If the House will bear with me a moment, I would like to put into 'Hansard' a statement of the different amounts which will be paid by the Dominion out of the Dominion exchequer for the administration of these provinces for some years to come. We are to pay each province as follows:—

For the support of the government and legislature.. . . .	\$ 50,000
On an estimated population of 250,000 at 80 cents per head.. . . .	200,000
Interest at the rate of 5 per cent on the sum of \$8,107,500, as a set-off against the debt of the other provinces which we assumed when they entered confederation, or.. . . .	405,375
We are also to pay them by way of compensation for the public lands per year.. . . .	375,000
We also give them annually for five years to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings.. . . .	93,750

That makes a total of.. . . . \$1,124,125

This is to become in time, when the population shall have reached 800,000 souls, \$2,207,875 for each province or \$4,415,750 for the two.

I now come to the question which is creating—and I think very unnecessary—so much turmoil in the Dominion. I refer to the question of the schools. It is not my intention to dwell at any great length on the provisions of the British North America Act, as it seems to me everything that possibly could be said in that connection, on both sides of the argument, has been said by those who preceded me. My hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), who has just discussed this question with much ability, laid great stress upon the word 'province' and the word 'territory' and even the word 'district,' in considering whether clause 93 was applicable or not to the new provinces about to be created. On this same question, a very able argument was made by my right hon. friend, and also strong arguments were made by my hon.

friend the leader of the opposition and others who followed, notably the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But there is one principle which it seems to me has been lost sight of, and yet which I think should govern us in discussing this measure, and that is that constitutions are made for men and not men for constitutions. And standing here as a representative of the people, I ask myself should I confine my endeavours to discover a literal interpretation of that clause 93 of the British North America Act, or should I rather not look higher and think of the future, not only of the Northwest Territories, but of the whole Dominion? Should I not rather regard our constitution as having been framed for the purpose of working out the destinies of this country in the most satisfactory manner possible and of being interpreted in that spirit rather than of being interpreted in that narrow spirit which would set the letter of the law above its intention and make the future harmony and greatness of this country subordinate to the mere wording of a certain clause. My right hon. friend, when he brought down the measure, made a speech which was an admirable one from my point of view. He said we are bringing those two provinces into the Dominion by the means furnished us by the British North America Act in its clause 146. He also spoke about clause 93, but in the Bill itself he furnished the best argument which I think could be brought, following the ideas which I intend to follow during my remarks. In this connection I want to ask my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), who has just told us that the First Minister could not do everything he wanted to do, but did as much as he could, why he did not impress upon my right hon. friend the desirability of keeping the Bill intact as it was introduced. I am now speaking about clause 16. We have heard a great deal about that clause. It was that clause which brought about the resignation of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and we have heard a great many speeches about the position taken with regard to the same clause by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and some other ministers whose names were not mentioned. I do not propose to discuss why the right hon. gentleman the First Minister did not wait for the arrival of the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) before bringing in his Bill. That is none of my business. I take it for granted that when the government came down on the 21st February and put before the House of Commons a project of law, that measure was the result of the deliberations of the Dominion cabinet. And I repeat that I listened with pleasure to the speech of my right hon. friend when he in-