

degrees of nobility not known when it was made, as dukes, marquises and viscounts.

If we apply that rule of interpretation, taking into account the fact that no provision has been made specially for the Territories, then we reach the conclusion that the word 'province' is applicable also to the Territories which we acquired in 1870. Now, that power granted by section 93 is not unlimited; it is restricted by subsection 1 and 3. Such is the meaning of that section when liberally interpreted; and even if we should interpret it literally, it is still open to the same construction. Words should here engross our attention. Warfare is being carried on about the words 'province,' 'legislature,' and 'date of union.'

It is contended that the word province does not include territory. The definition of that word is not given in the English statutes, but it is given in ours. The Canadian legislature has stated what is the meaning of the word 'province.' We read in our statute-book what should be understood by the word 'province.' Subsection 13 of section 7 of our interpretation Act says:

The expression 'province' includes the Northwest Territories and the district of Keewatin.

It is thus seen that the word 'territory' is synonymous to 'province'; even the word 'district' is covered by its meaning, as in the case of Keewatin, for instance. Hon. gentlemen on the other side contend that the schools of the Northwest cannot be considered as actual statutory enactment, that they are mere ordinances voted by a mere council. Let us see what is the meaning of the word 'legislature' according to the Interpretation Act.

I shall read subsection 14 of that same section 7:

The expression 'Legislature,' 'Legislative Council' or 'Legislative Assembly,' includes the Lieutenant Governor in Council and also the Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the district of Keewatin.

Therefore, Sir, 'province,' 'territory,' 'legislature' and 'assembly' have the same meaning for us inhabitants of Canada. In fact, the definition which I have just given is in accord with the principles laid down by the Interpretation Act of 1889 in England, as regards the word legislature. It is as follows: Any authority other than the imperial government empowered to pass laws within the British possessions. So that, according to the imperial interpretation Act itself, the Northwest Territories were governed by a legislature and the laws passed by that body are the laws of a legislature. Let us now pass on to the word 'union.' That word may mean Canada or the Confederation. It is the latter meaning which should be given to the word.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS.

I read the following in the American and English Encyclopædia of Language:

'The territories are as much a part of the United States as are the states. The ultimate purpose is that they shall, as soon as practicable be organized into states, which shall take equal place or part in the union.'

As to the term 'date of union', its meaning for the four provinces is the first of July, 1867. For the others, it means the date of their admission into the Dominion.

Section 109 shows this. Although that section mentions the three provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, the Privy Council has decided that it applies to all the provinces. It will not be contended by any one after this that the words 'at the date of union' mean in this case the first of July, 1867.

Mr. Speaker, in voting for the Bill which is now submitted by the government, we are not, as I am aware, granting very much to the minority in the provinces of the Northwest. We are only confirming the present state of things. That state of things may not be very satisfactory; but legislators are often obliged to take circumstances into account. To those who may taunt him for not granting any more, the Prime Minister may say, like Solon: I have not given them the best laws, but I have given them the best laws they were capable of standing. Mr. Speaker, since the outset of this debate, we have had surprise after surprise. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are not generally very well disposed towards the provinces, while the Liberal party has always upheld their authority and sought to vindicate their rights. The other day, the hon. member for South York, (Mr. Maclean) assailed the right hon. Prime Minister, called him a tyrant and what not. It is not many years since I entered this House, but I have in the meantime become acquainted with the true inwardness of the feeling of hon. members on the other side as regards provincial rights. In 1902, in the course of a debate, the hon. member for South York spoke as follows:

I say that the interpretation of the law that has been given by the English Privy Council in regard to the distribution of rights as between the provinces, and the federal power, has been against the interest of the country as a whole. That I regret, I agree with the honourable member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) that some day we will have the whole jurisdiction in this parliament and in some way we will work it out, and in some way we will increase the federal power and wipe out gradually the provincial power. I take issue directly with the honourable gentlemen who oppose that view. I say that provincial government and the enlargement of provincial rights has not been in the interest of this country, and I say that Sir John A. Macdonald was right, and was a most far-seeing statesman if he believed in a legislative union and desired it carried out in this country.

Such are the feelings expressed by the hon.