

Could we not simply declare the fact that inasmuch as the province of Alberta has no debt it is to be paid in lieu of debt allowance this annual sum of \$400,000 a year in perpetuity, and make no reference whatever to the fact that it is based on any principle sum or its being 5 per cent on an estimated capital account or debt account. There will be perhaps opportunities before this has finally passed the House to further consider the question. I quite approve of the course that the minister is pursuing in endeavouring to get around the difficulty, but I respectfully submit that in my opinion he has not quite overcome the difficulty and the door is still left open for the contention that this \$400,000 is interest and that the capital is there and that the province of Alberta when it desires more money will have a right to call upon the Dominion of Canada to pay over the \$8,000,000, which is not the intention of this House and not the intention of this committee. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to read up the debates of 1884 as reported in 'Hansard' and observe the explicit language that was used by Sir Leonard Tilley and also by Sir Richard Cartwright at that time, and what seemed to be the clear understanding, that it never was the intention of the government to pay \$2,848,000 allowed to the province of Ontario, as additional capital it is surprising that at this distant date you will find an hon. gentleman interpreting that clause in language entirely different from what Sir Leonard Tilley and Sir Richard Cartwright used at that time. Sir Leonard Tilley was distinct in his declaration that the capital sum should never be paid and Sir Richard Cartwright who was the financial critic at that time accepted that explanation and understood that only the \$142,414 yearly which was called interest should be paid over. I would draw the attention of the minister to this item again and possibly if he still thinks there is any room for doubt, before the resolution passes the final stage he will give it his further valuable consideration and place the matter beyond all possible doubt by leaving out any reference at all to the matter of interest which would leave it clear that the sum on which this interest is calculated is not capital at all and that the province would have no claim on the capital sum.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the language of the Ontario case and the language used here differ so materially that there is reason for a view in respect to the Ontario case which would not apply to this case. However, if my hon. friend and I cannot agree as to the Ontario case, I suppose we can all agree that we should come to a clear understanding in this case. Let me say that in my opinion which I gave in the Ontario case I was of course speaking on the legal

advice of the Department of Justice. The intention of the statute must be gathered from the language of the statute itself and we must not as a rule look to the speeches of members of parliament to ascertain the precise meaning of the statutes. I think that hon. members on the other side who are lawyers will possibly say that in the form in which we now propose the motion, it becomes an annual payment and not a capital sum. However, I have not had the benefit of the advice of the Minister of Justice on this amendment as he is not present. I think in deference to the opinions of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) I should not let the resolution go out of committee before making the suggestion, and if before the final stage, after consultation, the Minister of Justice is of opinion that the matter is not clear, I would be glad to accept my hon. friend's suggestion to make it more clear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say this further that we are not bound, I think, exactly by the language of this resolution. We must read it in connection with the Act of 1885, cap. 4, which gave additional powers to the province with reference to the use of money under such uncertain conditions when it is for the purpose of constructing public works, so that we must not rely entirely upon the wording of this resolution, we must read it as it will be interpreted in the light of the legislation of 1885. That is a matter which I would desire the Minister of Justice to look over very carefully indeed. I may say to the Minister of Finance that I took good care to see the Minister of Justice. We were both in the city of Quebec and we had quite a good understanding on that question in a jocular way. I would invite the Minister of Finance to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to that special Act of Parliament to which he referred on a former occasion and have that Act of Parliament read in connection with the present legislation and see whether or not it might throw some other light upon it, or cause some other interpretation to be made at some future time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined to think that apart from the Act of 1885 with which I am not familiar, the amendment of the Minister of Finance would be sufficient for the purpose intended, although I have not given it very much consideration, but as I understand the matter will be open when we get into committee on the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I intended to have asked, when clause 2 was being discussed why it is that the sum of \$8,107,500 has been selected as the amount of debt the equivalent of interest on which shall be paid