adians and a united people, and that we all unite in our endeavours to make our country what it is destined to become. I heard my hon. friend from Labelle express the desire that there should be in the new provinces an Anglo-French alliance. Sir, I do not like that term as applied to Canada. An Anglo-French or an Anglo-German alliance may be all right in Europe, but I do not like to hear of it in Canada. When we speak of an Anglo-French alliance, it seems to me we speak of an agreement between two separate parties, and when we speak of such an agreement, we speak of something which may be entirely cancelled and made void. What I desire to see here is, not an Anglo-French or Anglo-German alliance, but a union of the several peoples who make up our population—a union that will be indissoluble, eternal and everlasting as the mountains and prairies of the new provinces themselves.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Bourassa) negatived: Yeas, 5; nays, 60.

On the amendment:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the amendment is put I would like to say two or three words. I have not been in favour of the sub-amendment that has just been disposed of for the same reason on account of which I am opposed to clause 16. But I am bound to say that if I could have supported clause 16 for the reasons which have been advanced by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches, I would have been obliged to support this amendment; because I think the reasons in the one case are as conclusive as in the other. The right hon. gentleman last evening when he went beyond any argument yet given, accepted the amendment of the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) because it continued a condition which now exists in the Territories, and which has been found satisfactory for a great many years. I will not trouble the House with quoting his words, that is the effect of them. Those are exactly the reasons that have been put forward by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). The only distinction between the two cases is the one put forward by the Prime Minister, and I think also by the Minister of Inland Revenue, which is, that the use of the French language in the courts of the Northwest Territories exists to-day, and has existed under sections 101 and 133 of the British North America Act. I do not think that the courts of the Northwest Territories were established under section 101 of the British North America Act, and therefore in my opinion that argument falls to the ground. I will not elaborate that now, I may do so afterwards if it is necessary; that is my opinion, for which I am prepared to give good and sufficient reasons. My main object in rising was to say that I think the Prime Minister, in his remarks this evening, has justified those who have argued in this House, and who have been much criticised for so arguing, that there was no compact by reason of which we should interfere with the control of the new provinces in respect of separate schools. The right hon. gentleman, to whose remarks in that regard I listened with a great deal of attention, made it abundantly clear that the policy of the government with regard to schools did not depend upon any compact. His language was absolutely explicit so far as that is concerned. It is true that a directly opposite view has been expressed many times on the other side of the House. I need only refer to the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in that regard, which is to be found in his speech of the 3rd of May, where he refers to what he calls a parliamentary compact made with the people of the Northwest.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A parliamentary compact under the Act of 1875, quoting the words of the Privy Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Exactly, the hon. gentleman is absolutely accurate in that regard, quoting, as I understand him, the language is one of the courts in that connection. It is made clear by the language of the Prime Minister that it is a parliamentary compact alone which is relied on. My right hon. friend does not depend upon the argument of the Minister of Inland Revenue; he agrees exactly with his Solicitor General who declares that the so-called compact of 1870 did not extend to the people of the Northwest Territories; it is therefore a parliamentary compact, a compact made in 1875 by the enactment of a statute. The argument based on that, as I understand it, is that although the legislation was temporary in its character, only to prevail while these Territories were to be governed as Territories, nevertheless there was a representation held out to the people who should go into them and that parliament is bound now to make good that representation. For reasons which I will not repeat, I have not been able to agree with that view. But I cannot distinguish between a parliamentary compact created by the Act of 1875 and a parliamentary compact created by the Act of 1877. That is the view I would take if I adopted the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the Act of 1875 constituted a compact which we are obliged to carry out, why does not the Act of 1875 constitute also a compact which we are obliged to carry out? I have not been able to concur in the view that there is a compact; I have regarded both these matters as subjects proper to be dealt with by the people of the new provinces. My position with regard to the one is my position with regard to the other. Further