

AUTONOMY, PROVINCIAL, IN THE NORTH-WEST—*Con.*

*Borden, R. L. (Carleton, Ont.)—Con.*

painging out of his mind—5649. We have some other interests to consider occasionally—5650. Ingram questions the reasons that the government had given for placing the boundary where it is—5660. Is Athabaska under the present territorial government in any way?—5663. We are adopting a middle course, which is perhaps not very logical—5664. Apparently we are not exactly following the course of fertile lands—5665. Thinks that would be satisfactory—5666. Fitzpatrick was to give an explanation—5672. Perhaps he will be prepared to give his views to-morrow afternoon—5673. There is a good deal in Fitzpatrick's suggestions—5674. We can reserve power to increase the representation—5675. Possibility of evading the B. N. A. Act—5676. Incorrect to say that representation in the Senate does not depend upon population—5683. The original took more account of population than did the constitution of the United States—5684. Intention of confederation was that some regard be paid to population—5685. Will Fitzpatrick put his amendments on 'Hansard'?—5686.

I do not know that I fully understand the exact position—5719—taken by the government with regard to the combined effect of sections 2 and 16—5720. The premier took a view with regard to the constitutional question—5721. Bourassa and those who stand on the rock of the constitution—5722. I understand that apart from section 16, section 2 is sufficient—5723. Sir John Thompson was only dealing with the effects of the ordinances—5724. Act of 1875, if unrepealed, remains in force—5725. As the ordinances are in the Act of 1875—5726. Does the minister regard section 16 as having the same effect?—5727. Willing to allow section 2 to stand—5728. Has Fitzpatrick come round to Sifton's opinion?—5735. We have to look at the legislation from the standpoint of a possible election—5752. That hardly seems to meet what I was suggesting to the minister—5753. Do you not limit your power as to that when you once establish them into provinces?—5756. The situation is a little peculiar—5757. They are already represented in this House as territories—5758. I am not criticising the policy—5759.

It may be as Fitzpatrick says, that it will work out all right—5931. Of course, it may create some inconvenience, but it would hardly justify us in going to the imperial parliament—5932. I am inclined to think that I have seen expressions like this in the imperial statutes—5936. The object is to repeal the N. W. T. Act and to incorporate into this section the provisions—5973. It might be found more expedient, if not absolutely necessary, to adopt another course—5938. For example, there is the provision in that N. W. T. Act with regard to the application of the criminal law—5939. There are no words of that character in this clause so far as I have noticed—5940. If McCarthy (L. G.) will look at the Territorial Act carefully,

AUTONOMY, PROVINCIAL, IN THE NORTH-WEST—*Con.*

*Borden, R. L. (Carleton, Ont.)—Con.*

he will find that there are such provisions—5941. Is the word 'societies,' in the third subsection, intended to cover corporations of all kinds?—5942. If you can amend the Acts, why cannot you abolish them?—5943. Does Fitzpatrick propose to add any clause with regard to extra provincial companies?—5944. A company incorporated in Nova Scotia, the head office of which is situated in London—5945. I would not like, however, to have it passed, as I propose to move an amendment—5946. While contracts must be observed in good faith, that does not touch the question of the legislative sphere of action—5955. Is that a subject of contract?—5956. It would be a matter for the consideration of the federal executive—5957. I observe that there are some correlative obligations on the Hudson Bay Company—5959. I think this and the next clause might stand till next week—5960.

I would be quite willing to let it go through on that basis—5810. Unless we have some restriction of that kind there are great opportunities for fraud—5811. What will be the status of the court in the meantime before the legislature deals with it?—5813. I think that this section had better stand until we have had an opportunity of considering these schedules—5815. It would have been proper to refer this question to some independent tribunal—5816. I would have been glad to have had Fitzpatrick's view on the subject to-day—5818. There was nothing before the committee when Fielding made that rather peculiar speech—5833. Mr. Oliver, to obstruct this legislation, saw fit to make one of those pop-gun speeches—5840. The whole burthen of speech was to show what, in his estimation, was the difference—5841. The quotation of Fitzpatrick was accurate this far—5851. I will pass over the pamphlet—5852. May I ask Paterson a question?—5884. I think Paterson has asked that question twenty times—5886. I am asking what Paterson's contention is—5887. Why did not Oliver say so ten minutes ago?—5892. We cannot get anything straight now—5893.

I do not know whether it is the intention of Fitzpatrick to go on this afternoon with clause 16 and move the amendment—5985. The provisions with respect to the lands in the draft Bill submitted by Mr. Haultain are contained in sections 18, 19, 20 and 21—5986. These are all the provisions, at least all that I have noticed, relating to the disposal of lands—5987. It is largely based upon the necessity of retention of these lands for the purpose of immigration—5988. The settlement and development of the country thus created must be a very potent factor—5989. The government have not founded their policy upon good substantial grounds—5990. I think that if we look to the example of the United States we would rather reach the opposite conclusion—5991. I for one have in conclusion to express my regret that the government have not seen fit to adopt that policy—