

Would the right hon. gentleman answer me that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked the right hon. gentleman whether or not the constitutional right in virtue of which he says that separate schools are to be imposed forever upon the people of the Northwest is to be found in section 93 of the British North America Act, or whether it is to be found somewhere else?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In section 93.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, I would ask my right hon. friend one more question. If he is determined to adhere as he says he is determined to adhere literally, absolutely, to the terms of the constitution by which we are all bound, why does he not apply section 93, instead of mangling it by the special provisions of this clause?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I answer, that I apply section 93.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And I answer the right hon. gentleman that he does nothing of the kind. Here is his amendment:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province with the substitution for subsection 1 of the said section 93, of the following subsection:

1. Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories, passed in the year 1901.

And so forth. Does the right hon. gentleman believe that, if section 93 were applied in its entirety without any amendment, exactly the same result would be produced as that which is produced by the interpolation of these words? Will he answer that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall answer my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) in due time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I challenge the right hon. gentleman to answer that question directly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I accept the challenge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman give the answer now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think a discussion can properly be carried on in this way, and I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman's speech. I will answer in my own time and in my own way.

Mr. FOSTER. Come out of the woods.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will tell my right hon. friend—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) a question?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that his policy is to apply section 93 of the British North America Act simply. Why is it that, in his resolution on this subject he seeks to apply it with a peculiar construction which he chooses to put upon it and not simply and directly?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because that is the construction I believe it bears. That is the construction by which I am prepared to stand. And I will give my hon. friend a motion by-and-by, which I think will satisfy even his discriminating taste in that regard. Now, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not prepared, at least at the moment, to give a plain answer to a plain question. He says he is applying the constitution. But when we look at his measure, we find that he is not applying the constitution, but he is mangling the constitution before he applies it. I ask him: Do you wish us to understand by this language which you are substituting for the constitution that you mean to bring about exactly the same thing that would be brought about by the constitution if you did not mangle it in that way? And he says he will answer in his own time and in his own way. I should think it would be easy to answer at once so plain and simple a question. I say that if section 93 means what I suppose the right hon. gentleman says it means—although he will not say it—then there is no need to change that section; there is no need to add to it or to take from it. On the other hand, if section 93 does not mean the same as the amendment of the right hon. gentleman, then, I say, we have no right to make a change in the words. That is the dilemma in which I place the right hon. gentleman. If it means the same thing, what is the necessity of the amendment which he says is merely carrying out the provisions of the constitution; and if it does not mean the same thing, by what right does the right hon. gentleman stand up in this House and move an amendment which alters the wording of the constitution, while at the same time he declares that he is adhering to the terms of the constitution without any amendment whatever?

The right hon. gentleman is very particular about some of the provisions of his amended section 93: he is very particular about subsection 3, both in his speech and in his resolution. He thinks it extremely important that the powers of the new provinces shall be restricted in accordance with the amendment which he has introduced into the terms of section 93. The right hon. gentleman I suppose, expects that this legisla-