Mr. SCOTT. I would ask my hon. friend what construction he places on the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon when he proposed to strike out section 16 and substitute this:

> The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province in so far as the same are applicable under the terms thereof.

What is the meaning of that?

Mr. LALOR. May I ask the hon. gentleman if that is the way he answers a question—by asking another?

Mr. SCOTT. I venture to say that my hon. friend cannot tell me, nor can the hon. leader of the opposition himself tell me what that means. It means about the same thing as the amendment he proposed formerly in relation to education. The hon. leader of the opposition admitted, when the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue questioned him on the floor of the House of Commons, that he did not know how it would work out, and that he did not know what it meant. Does the hon. leader of the opposition think when he speaks before the people of this country and before the members of this House that he is speaking to children? Let him go to the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway or to the head of the Canadian Northern Railway and ask these gentlemen if they think these words specifying the intention of parliament to exercise its inherent power of expropriation do not mean anything.

Mr. HENDERSON. I rise to a point of order. I submit that the hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. SCOTT. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to move an amendment, and I trust I am not out of order in discussing the amendment which I propose to move. It concerns the Canada Pacific Railway exemption feature and the inherent right of expropriation possessed by this parliament with regard to that exemption feature. I was proceeding to remind the House that a couple of years ago we granted certain rights to the Canadian Northern Railway, and it was proposed at that time that it should be specified in the Bill that parliament retained the right to expropriate. I can tell the hon. leader of the opposition that Mr. Willilam Mackenzie, the president of the Canadian Northern Railway, did not think these words meaningless, because he opposed the proposition strenuously, and whenever the same proposition has been made with regard to a railway which is being chartered, it has been opposed by the promoters of the charter. It is not so long ago that discussion took place in this House on the Grand Trunk Pacific proposition, and if my memory serves me rightly, we had an amendment moved on the other side of the House that the Bill should specify that under such and such conditions parliament would expropriate the undertaking. Am I stating the fact correctly? I put that squarely to the hon. leader of the opposition. Silence, I suppose, gives consent; but we may as well have the actual proof. On May 26, 1904, the hon. leader of the opposition summarized certain resolutions which he had in the previous months presented to this House with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific proposition. Some of these amendments, I suppose, were not entirely meaningless, but so many were presented that I venture to say that no single person in the whole of Canada can tell at this moment whether the hon. leader of the opposition faced north, south, east or west on the Grand Trunk Pacific question. Here is what the hon. gentleman said on May 26, 1904, as found at page 3558 of 'Hansard':

> We then moved an amendment that if the Grand Trunk Pacific should exercise its right to force on the government any unprofitable branches at the end of fifty years, the government might take all or any of the remaining branches. In this way we desired to prevent this country being placed in the position of having to take and operate unprofitable branches without having the option of controlling the situation by taking also all the branches this company might find profitable.

That surely was a meaningless proposition, because parliament had the inherent right of expropriation. The hon. gentleman was needlessly taking up the time of parliament when he discussed that proposition at great length.

> We further moved that the government should have haulage rights and running powers over the western division for the same period granted to the company over the eastern division. Both these amendments were rejected.
>
> Then we proposed that the government should be empowered to expropriate the railways from ocean to ocean, upon paying fair compensation, and in addition we moved a further amendment empowering the government to do so in case these railways should not carry out the true intent of the agreement, or should combine or conspire to divert traffic to foreign ports.

By the vehicle of these words of his own I hand back to the leader of the opposition all the criticism and sarcasm which he applied to the proposition I took the responsibility of presenting to the House this afternoon. What was the main purpose of the remarks of the hon. gentleman and what has been the main purpose of many of the remarks of the hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to members from the Northwest Territories sitting behind the government? From day to day, by means of sneers and other references, they have attempted to lead the country to believe that the Liberal members from the Territories have been entirely dominated by the government and ready at any moment to sacrifice the interests of the Territories.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.