

parliament of Canada should make the grant against their wishes.

And if the members from the Northwest Territories do not agree to this grant out of the liberties of the people of the new provinces, the Prime Minister will tell the parliament of Canada that they should not make that grant against the wishes of these members.

There is one other point upon which I shall dwell for a moment and which is, perhaps a little out of its place here. I refer to the argument which my right hon. friend made not only to-day, but also a month ago with regard to the tax exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In triumphant tones on both occasions he likened this matter to an obligation upon parliament to observe the terms of a contract; he has said: in establishing these Territories you cannot rid the people of the Northwest from that exemption which was imposed by a statute passed in 1880. He told us that no one would suggest any such thing, and that no one had ever attempted to suggest it. Well, the right hon. gentleman's memory is not very good. I myself had the temerity to suggest that very thing in this parliament. I said two years ago that I thought the government should seriously take into consideration the question of removing that exemption—and parliament can do it—but I said that parliament must strictly observe the terms of its obligation and that in such case it would be absolutely necessary for parliament to institute an inquiry and to make good to the Canadian Pacific Railway everything to which they were entitled by reason of the removal of the exemption.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Postmaster General says 'hear, hear,' and when he and the Prime Minister can show me any contract by virtue of which this restriction must be placed upon the people of the Northwest, I will support the measure they have brought down. Why, Sir, the only contract which exists is in the terms of the constitution, and I have said over and over again to-day, that in this matter I myself, and I believe every hon. gentleman on this side of the House, is absolutely prepared to stand or fall by the constitution. But before I depart from the question whether or not this restriction shall be imposed on the people of the Northwest Territories against their will, I have one inquiry to make from my right hon. friend. The Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories said that he was not consulted with regard to the provisions of section 16 as originally drafted. He has stated in a letter—and I have not heard it contradicted—that there was only a casual reference made to the education question—one of the most important questions of all, surely—that there was only a casual reference to it on the Friday be-

fore this Bill was introduced, and that at 12 o'clock on the very day on which the Prime Minister introduced the Bill a type-written copy of this provision was handed to him across the table. Mr. Haultain has further stated, that the Prime Minister was not then present, that the Postmaster General was not present, that the Minister of Justice was present for a short time, but the only gentleman who remained present during the whole of that interview, the only gentleman whom the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories had any opportunity of consulting, (and that only three hours before the introduction of the Bill) was the Secretary of State. What was the answer of the right hon. gentleman to that assertion? It was this, that Mr. Haultain—a gentleman, as he always is—had seen fit to express, in the conclusion of his letter, his appreciation of courtesy which had always been extended to his colleagues and himself. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman at this stage whether or not the provisions of that amended section were at any time submitted to Mr. Haultain before they were submitted to this parliament? Has Mr. Haultain been consulted with regard to this amended section?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He has not. My right hon. friend has certainly abandoned most clearly his former role of advocate of the liberties of the people. Once he was ready to consult them. Once he was ready to meet their will. Once he was ready to bow to their will when constitutionally expressed. But when the Prime Minister of these Territories, which, according to the right hon. gentleman possess now almost complete rights of self-government, when the Prime Minister of these Territories and his colleagues come to Ottawa to consult with this government, and when a great question is raised, when passion and prejudice are being appealed to, the right hon. gentleman deliberately refuses to take the premier of the Northwest Territories into his confidence or seek his advice and assistance with regard to this measure. There were sunny ways in days gone by. There seem to be different ways now. I do not know for what reason the First Minister of the Territories was ignored. He and his colleagues are the accredited representatives of the Northwest Territories. They were summoned to Ottawa, and are here, for the very purpose of being consulted and of advising with regard to this measure. But although the situation is so serious, as the right hon. gentleman has depicted it, he ventures, in the face of public opinion in this country, to bring down this measure in its amended form without having given the Prime Minister of the Northwest Terri-