

Canada, because it is into the Northwest that our immigration will largely flow, and it is there that we must expect development and progress to a very unusual degree in the immediate future.

Why, the very form of section 16 and of the substituted section show that the government are not serious in the contention which the right hon. gentleman has made. What had they inserted in this Bill before we came to section 16? They had inserted section 2, which I will read to the House:

2. The provisions of the British North America Acts 1867 to 1886, shall apply to the province of Alberta in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the provinces heretofore comprised in the Dominion, as if the said province of Alberta had been one of the provinces originally united, except in so far as varied by this Act and except such provisions as are in terms made, or by reasonable intendment may be held to be, specially applicable to or only to affect one or more and not the whole of the said provinces.

Has not the right hon. gentleman over and over again in this House, both upon the first reading of this Bill and in the speech which he made this afternoon, told us that it is his intention solely and absolutely to apply to the Northwest Territories of Canada the provisions of that constitution under which all Canadians live. Now I ask him, and I ask every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who proposes to deal with this question, why section 2 is not sufficient to apply to the Northwest Territories of Canada, every provision of the constitutional statutes which it enumerates? If my right hon. friend proposes to stand on the rock of the constitution, what portion of the rock of the constitution is omitted from section 2? It goes further, I believe, in the direction in which the right hon. gentleman desires to persevere, than it should go having regard to the fact that this is not a province already constituted coming into the Dominion, but is a province to be created by the very Bill we are now discussing. I will have something more to say about that when this Bill is in committee. But putting aside for the moment that question, is or is not my right hon. friend sincere, are or are not his colleagues sincere, when they tell this House that they desire the control of education in the Northwest Territories to be regulated solely by the provisions of the constitution? If they are sincere, then I say that they have everything in section 2 that can possibly be given—if they stand as the right hon. gentleman says he does stand, on the rock of the constitution. Why, the matter is not arguable. For what reason do they insert these words?

Except in so far as varied by this Act.

If you are to stand on the rock of the constitution, if my right hon. friend and his colleagues are prepared to stand or fall by the provisions of the constitution, how

is it that they desire to vary in one jot, tittle, or iota the provisions of the constitution? My right hon. friend has accused the press of this country of fomenting discord, of arousing passion, and strife and prejudice.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to tell my right hon. friend, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman who is venturesome enough to say, 'hear, hear,' that what has agitated the people of this country is not so much what has been said by the press as the knowledge that the right hon. gentleman, in this Bill, has in express terms departed from the provisions of the constitution. The British North America Act, 1867 to 1886, is to apply to these two provinces, to apply absolutely and in their whole terms. Are they? Let the right hon. gentleman answer in the terms of his own measure: No, they are only to apply 'except in so far as varied by this Act.' And yet with that provision staring him in the face, not only in section 2 but in section 16 of the Bill, he ventures, on his authority as a public man of long experience, on his responsibility as Prime Minister of Canada, on his honour as leader of this House, to stand here and tell us that he abides by the constitution, that he stands upon the rock upon which it is founded. Why, surely, the matter is not arguable. If the right hon. gentleman is sincere, let him strike out these words 'in so far as varied by this Act,' let him abolish section 16, and then you will have in truth and in their entirety those very provisions which are established upon the rock of the constitution. Let us look at the substituted section. It is worse, it seems to me—certainly it is no better than the original section:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—In Committee of the Whole—On Bill No. 69—Will move that the following section be substituted for section 16 of the said Bill:

Section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province.

So far very good.

Shall apply to the said province.

How apply? Absolutely, in its entirety, unamended, without variation? No, Sir. Here again is the answer of my right hon. friend in the very words which he put upon the order paper of this House only the night before last:

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

We are amending in this parliament section 93 of the British North America Act, which the right hon. gentleman says is applicable to the new territories. First, he lays it down in as distinct a way as ever I heard anything laid down in this parliament,