man takes out nine words, and for these he substitutes thirty-six words and says: There is subsection (1) of the British North America Act. And it is done so gently. Why, he simply says that Nos. 29 and 30 of the ordinances shall be the basis of that section, and that the union shall be assumed to have taken place on the 1st of July, 1905—a union that took place thirty-five years ago. He changes the date of union simply in order to enable him to say that there are separate schools in existence on the 1st of July, 1905, while if he said that the union was on 1st of July, 1870, he would have had to admit there were then no separate schools.

There is a feature of this change to which I desire to call special attention. When the hon. gentleman succeeds in getting his new subsection 1 made the law as to Alberta and Saskatchewan, these two provinces will be in a different position from any other province in the Dominion that has entered since confederation, and also from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I think the Minister of Justice will not deny that. Alberta and Saskatchewan, the moment this law comes into operation, will not have the same freedom as others; they will be more strictly bound than Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba or British Columbia. And I will explain why. If any one of these provinces should hereafter choose to pass a separate school law and later on find that law objectionable and desire to amend it in a way that would affect some privilege previously granted, what would be the remedy of those aggrieved? Such a province might be quite willing to enact a separate school law knowing that it had the right to repeal that law, and knowing that the risk it ran through that repeal is that there might be an appeal to this Dominion parliament for remedial legislation, and it might be willing to take that risk of what this Dominion would do. But what will be the case with Alberta and Saskatchewan? They are put in the position of being bound by subsection 1 to retain all the provisions of ordinances 29 and 30 which give any privilege to the minority. Any Act they might pass to curtail one single privilege granted under ordinances 29 and 30 would be ultra vires. It would not be necessary to come here for a remedial law; but the cabinet, sitting in chambers, would disallow the amending Act and put an end to it. It is a much more skilful system of coercion than was ever attempted upon Manitoba. There is no question as to the effect of it. If I am wrong, I should be glad if the Minister of Justice will correct me now. I doubt if there is an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who ever believed that in approving of the proposed amending clause he was changing the whole basis of the law and putting Alberta and Saskatchewan in a worse position than any of these provinces to which I have referred. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is absent, but had he been here, I would have asked him how it happened that when he explained this Bill he did not point out to the House this very material change he proposes in the condition of these provinces from that of the other provinces I have mentioned. I am not aware that the First Minister said one word upon that subject. I doubt whether any hon. gentleman on the other side understood that the law was being so changed that it would be ultra vires for Alberta or Saskatchewan to pass any law to alter any privilege under ordinances 29 and 30. Why, fancy the position of these provinces. Here, for example, is an ordinance providing for the formation of the Board of Education. That board must have exactly five members, of whom three must be Protestants and two Roman Catholics. The province cannot alter that, but it must have always three Protestants and always two Roman Catholic on this Board of Education, or one party or other may say that their rights are being invaded. You must, for all time, have neither more nor less. The Minister of Justice was just about right when he said that he intended to have no doubt about the position. I think there can be no doubt of it.

Now the Minister of Justice went through the several addresses. I do not intend to follow him at any length, but in order that I may state clearly my point of view, it is necessary that I should follow him very shortly. Under section 146 of the Britsh North America Act, provision was made for taking in provinces and territories. There was this distinction between taking in a province and taking in a territory. A province was to be taken in upon an address of the legislative assembly of the province and of the two Houses of this parliament. But inasmuch as a territory had no legislature, it was provided that a territory should be taken in on an address of this parliament alone. Well, in 1867 the two House of Parliament did address Her Majesty and ask that the Territories should be taken into the union. The hon. gentleman went on to read an Act of 1868 and other matters, at some length, but I do not see that they have any bearing whatever upon the question that we are discussing; probably his object was to give an historical narrative of what took place. The fact was that after the address of December, 1867, there was delay owing to the negotiations pending to buy out the interests of the Hudson Bay Company. That caused delay, but in course of time the purchase was made, and again in 1869 our address was renewed. I will read a word or two from that address. It prayed:

That under section 146 of the British North America Act, 1867, and the provisions of the imperial Act, 31 and 32 Vic., Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories might be united in the Dominion as prayed for by and in the terms