

we have not. It is for this House and for the country to determine according to their judgment whether these reasons are sound or not.

The British North America Act, in assigning the rights and power to the parliament of Canada and the provincial powers, distinctly provides how far we may go, but nowhere does it contain a provision that we may legislate with regard to what educational system a new province must have, and when we do that we are doing what, in my judgment, is improper. The right hon. the premier seems to assume that the federal parliament is a supreme body which is over and above the provincial parliaments, and which can, of its own will, exercise a patronizing or paternal control to the extent of compelling the provincial parliaments to do what they do not desire to do. Talk about being a supreme body! What does Watson say in regard to it? The federal parliament is not a supreme body at all, it has no over-towering powers, it has no powers that are so much above or beyond a provincial parliament that it can exercise them over that provincial parliament. He goes into the history of how we got our federal parliament, and says:

It must be borne in mind as regards the internal and material interests of each of the provinces, their municipal self-government, their systems of education, their public lands and their development, and the administration of justice, the local legislatures are of much greater importance than the federal parliament.

Much greater importance.

Over these vital and complex functions of a free commonwealth which are known as civil rights and which are the life and marrow of local self-government and constitutional citizenship, the provincial parliament rules supreme.

And the federal parliament cannot interfere. He says:

It must be borne in mind that the federal parliament is the offspring of the provincial legislatures;—

Not the provincial parliament the offspring of the federal parliament.

—that it is not their progenitor; and that in confiding to it such of their powers as were necessary to establish it as a greater institution than themselves there were yet certain powers which they reserved for their own behoof.

He argued that we had a federal parliament, why? Because the provincial parliaments gave up part of their powers to make it, but that the provincial powers were supreme, and must always be so within their rights. We established the federal parliament and the provinces gave it certain powers, and the federal parliament can only exercise these powers; when it attempts to go beyond that and interfere with provincial rights, then it is doing what a higher authority than it, that is the pro-

vincial parliament, says it cannot do. The rights of the provincial parliament within its sphere are supreme and brook no interference. I believe that is as true as the truism given by the premier with regard to the rights of majorities. It was not the federal parliament, as I said, which condescended to give rights to provincial parliaments; the condescension was on the part of the provincial parliaments, and they established the federal parliament. The rights of the provincial parliaments were an inheritance belonging to them; they had inherited their rights and enjoyed their rights, and any rights or powers which the federal parliament has to-day are mere hereditary rights given to it by the provincial parliaments; therefore, the provincial parliaments ought to be supreme and are supreme within their own jurisdiction.

The educational clauses in this Bill are purely an interference, in my judgment, with provincial rights, and on this ground I am opposed to them. I do not mean that I am opposed to the whole Bill, but I am opposed to the educational clauses. The struggles which have taken place in the past with regard to provincial rights, and the contention of the Reform party that provincial rights must be maintained at all hazards, ought to be as strongly impressed upon the minds of the Liberals as it was in the past, and they ought to endeavour to carry out that principle. They should not neglect that principle. We have had many fights of this nature. We had the struggle over the Streams Bill, and very strong feelings were created; we had it over the Boundary Award; we had it over the Hotel Licenses Bill, which was known as the McCarthy Act; we had it over the timber and mineral rights of the provinces; we had it over the Manitoba Remedial Bill, the New Brunswick School Bill; and in every one of these cases the Reform party stood on the same ground, that is, in defence of provincial rights. Where are they to-day?

Some hon. MEMBERS. We are there. On the same spot.

Mr. SPROULE. The Reform party carried Ontario for the provincial government over and over again on provincial rights, and because they stood up in defence of provincial rights. Where are they to-day? I say they have drifted away from their moorings.

An hon. MEMBER. Where were you at that time?

Mr. SPROULE. Where was I? I was in this House at that time, and on many of these measures I agreed with the hon. gentlemen, because I thought they were right. I am opposed to them to-day, because I think they are wrong. I am where I was then, but they are not where they were then. They remind me very much of the story of the Indian who was hunt-