

dary line between the United States and Canada. Whether that is to prevent the destruction of water-power, or whether it is for the purpose of deepening the channels and thereby increasing the facilities for transportation, I am unable to say. Probably the government, when they refer to this question, can inform the House. Neither the mover nor the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne gave us any information upon that point. There are other points which I think should be considered in connection with the water, which are incident to both countries, and that is particularly the preservation of the fisheries.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Here we are expending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of stocking the waters of the country that belong as much to the United States as to Canada. And yet the destruction that is being made by the United States fishermen nullifies to a very great extent the action and policy of the Canadian government in stocking these waters. I need not point out the different rivers where this state of affairs exists, and unless the United States government—because, I believe it pertains to them and not to the Dominion government—are willing to enter into some agreement for the protection of the fisheries, I think it is time for the Canadian government to stop expending money in stocking the Detroit river and many other rivers that separate the two countries. While we are protecting the fish, United States fishermen are destroying them; while we are protecting and increasing the product, they are reaping the benefit without any cost to them. The next paragraph is perhaps about the only one—and I do not say that disrespectfully, because the premier in the remarks he made to the House the other day used almost the same expression—that the only important measure indicated in the address is that which proposes to grant provincial autonomy to the Northwest. Those who have given this subject any study will readily admit the difficulties that present themselves in granting the rights which the western provinces are now claiming, and have been claiming for some time. I might, I think, parenthetically say that had it not been for the elec-

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

tion which has just taken place, it is a grave question whether we should have had this paragraph in the speech. All who have kept themselves posted on current events know that the demand from the Northwest Territories for provincial autonomy has been denied them over and over again. They were going to the elections upon this question, and in order to head them off, a declaration was made by the premier, or a telegram rather, that if the government were returned to power they were going to grant what the Territories had been asking for for some time. It was well for them that an election was to occur at once, for otherwise this paragraph would not have appeared in the speech. The remarks made by the hon. mover of the address suggest a thought to me in connection with this matter. He referred particularly to the duty of government and parliament. When the French and English came together after the battle on the Plains of Abraham, it was the duty of the government, in all cases of this kind, to remove those questions which arise that create disunion and dissatisfaction between religion and race. I quite concur in the remarks made by the hon. gentleman. When the hon. gentleman attempts to make a provision of that kind, I think the same difficulties will present themselves to him as presented themselves to those who have been governing the country since confederation. You may make provision in the statutes to remove every difficulty to which he has called the attention of the House, but, as the country grows and the population is of a different class and of a different character and have different ideas of local self government, then the difficulty arises as it did in the past with Manitoba. There is no use of our hiding the fact that though provision is made in reference to these vexed questions when the Bill is introduced granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest, how it will work out is still in the womb of the future. We know nothing about it. When the Bill is presented to the House we will find the same difficulties arising from that question as have presented themselves in the past. My hon. friends opposite will remember the difficulties in 1874, when the Manitoba constitution was framed and given to Manitoba. It was then thought that no question could arise in the