

provinces will thus stand on a footing of entire equality.

I was curious, when I heard that quoted, to find out what the noble earl really did say. I find that my hon. friend from Labelle has left out from the quotation of the noble earl's utterances three or four cogent sentences. We find that where he stops he says 'and he continues.' Then he cites the paragraph down to the word 'consent.' Then he goes on with a sentence which appears also in the same paragraph, leaving out these words:

It is an understanding which, as it only concerns the local interests affected, is not one that parliament would be willing to disturb, even if in the opinion of parliament it is susceptible of amendment; but I am bound to add, as the expression of my own opinion, that the terms of the agreement appear to me to be equitable and judicious.

Now, the hon. gentleman left out the very pith of that passage, which went to show what the noble earl was contending for with regard to the new provinces, and the clauses which he referred to in his speech were only incorporated at that time as touching the local interests affected.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. If I remember aright, that declaration of Lord Carnarvon was made on the 19th of February, and there is another one made on the 22nd of February in answer to Lord Shaftesbury, which is quite complete. Perhaps my hon. friend has not seen it.

Mr. BOYCE. I think I understand the statement that was made, and if my hon. friend will read it again he will find that it does not at all detract from what the noble earl said on the 19th of February. I fancy the noble earl was too much of a statesman to say one thing to-day and a different thing the day after. I think my hon. friend will be satisfied as to that when he sees what the noble earl did say on the 22nd of February and contrasts it with what he said on the 19th. But if the hon. gentleman is a champion of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I would ask him if he justifies the emasculation that was made of the noble earl's speech?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I have not before me the speech of Lord Carnarvon, but I sent for the imperial 'Hansard' and read it, and I did not see any emasculation.

Mr. BOYCE. I read from the Canadian 'Hansard,' page 3399, and I read from the imperial 'Hansard,' page 565, and I read the part which has been emasculated. I say that when the hon. gentleman said to this House that the noble earl 'continued' with his remarks in such a strain, and then dodged three or four very cogent and restrictive sentences, though quoting it as a whole—I say that he was guilty of emasculating a part of the noble earl's utterances in quoting them to this House.

Mr. BOYCE.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. The hon. member for Labelle never said he was quoting it as a whole. He said the noble earl continued in the same speech, and so he did. It is in the same speech.

Mr. BOYCE. Now, Sir, this Bill provides, or pretends to provide, for self-government in the Northwest provinces. There are two important questions which have occupied a great deal of time in this House in respect to self-government of the new provinces, the question as to whether this Bill gives the new created provinces power to deal with their lands, and the question with respect to the educational clauses. Now, the right hon. gentleman introduced this Bill with some very fulsome and very eloquent remarks. He is apt at simile, but in the introduction of this Bill I fancy there are hon. gentlemen here who were impressed with the fact that he made, in contrast with what has now been disclosed, some very awkward similes. He introduced this Bill as a measure which was going to give the new provinces 'the fulness of the rights that appertain to provinces; that he was going to' stamp them with the seal of 'Canadian nationality'; that he was going to 'crown them'—mark the term, nothing could be stronger, or wider, or broader—with absolute autonomy. But when we come to examine the Bill we find that it falls far short of granting them the freedom of self-government, it falls far short of granting to them full and absolute autonomy. It is hard to see where the crown of local self-government is pre-eminent in the constitution of these provinces. Now, first with regard to their position in respect to the lands. When the right hon. gentleman welcomed these provinces into the Dominion sisterhood, he welcomed them as one would welcome, by analogy, the heir who comes of age. But with what rights does he clothe the heir that comes to his majority and is entitled to his heritage and his patrimony? Does he say to the heir, to these provinces: 'You have now attained your majority, and we will now clothe you with all that pertains to your majority?' But this Bill says another thing. The Bill says that the heir shall have no heritage; the Bill says that the heir shall have no estates. The right hon. gentleman's fulsome speech and eloquent words indicate that the heir shall come to his full estate, that he shall have absolute power to guide his own destinies, that he shall have the fulness of rights that appertain to the provinces; at the same time he says in his Bill: You shall have no estates so far as the lands are concerned you shall have no right to deal with these lands, you shall have no heritage, nothing to pass on to your children, for all time you shall be dominated by your father, you shall be restricted to the pocket money that is doled out to you by him, and you shall be tied to him, instead of having the freedom which the words of the right hon. gentle