

exercise control over them. It can give good advice, but it has no right to give commands.

When the Territories have a sufficient population to entitle them to become a province, they must decide for themselves whether they will have separate schools or not.

I have my view as to what will be the best decision for them to arrive at, but I must not impose on them my views as to how they should be governed after they have attained their majority.

I think I have quoted sufficient legal authority to show that the act of the government is unconstitutional, that the question of education should be left entirely to the provinces, that the provinces should be given their legislative freedom in this matter, and that the action of the government cannot be defended on grounds of public policy, but is an unwarranted interference with provincial jurisdiction, and is likely to be a source of trouble among the mixed population who will make in that country their homes in the future.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria). I must congratulate the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat on the free and exhaustive manner in which he has discussed this question, and I am afraid that, as a new member, with very little experience in this House, I shall be hardly able to follow the pace he has set for me in dealing with the subject under discussion. My hon. friend started out by finding fault with the land policy of this government. But that policy, Mr. Speaker, is not a new one. It is not a policy of to-day or yesterday, but one which was laid down by a gentleman who had about as able a mastery of public affairs in this country as any man who ever lived in it. I refer to the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, the greatest leader of which the party to which my hon. friend belongs could ever boast. It was he who laid down the land policy we have since followed, and in criticising that policy my hon. friend is setting himself at issue with that great leader.

The right hon. Sir John Macdonald, in 1870, laid down the land policy of this country. In 1872 he went to the country and was sustained. In 1878 he was returned to power; and he was sustained after that in the general elections of 1882, 1887 and 1891. I should say that was a sufficient test of the policy of Sir John Macdonald so far as the land question is concerned, and that it is rather too late in the day now to declare that it is a policy that should not be followed in this country. A few days ago the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) laid down a doctrine, which, if it is a wise one in regard to the matter to which he referred, would be equally wise here. Speaking of the school question, he said that the people of this country had recognized the wisdom of the policy of the Liberal party in 1896, and again in 1900, and again in 1904, and, so far as he was con-

cerned, he would not bother with the subject any longer, but would let well enough alone. I say if that was a wise policy with respect to the school question it is equally wise with respect to the land policy of Sir John Macdonald which has been so often approved by the people of this country. I submit that not only did the country generally commend that policy, but the province of Manitoba, in which the policy was first put in operation, has, if I am correctly informed, always given a handsome majority to the Conservative party of which Sir John Macdonald was the head. When the land policy of Sir John Macdonald has been approved by the province of Manitoba for thirty-five years, I think it comes—I will not say with ill grace but—with little force from the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) to find fault with the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), because he continues that policy.

Now, the hon. member for Marquette makes an onslaught on this government, and especially on the Prime Minister, because he does not change the boundaries of the province. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) to be strongly in favour of provincial rights and as strongly against anything that would interfere with those rights without the provinces being consulted. I happen to have in my hand the statute on this particular question showing that it is not open to any Prime Minister or government to deal with the question exactly as he may think proper. I gather from what the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) says that if there were a provision in this Bill extending the boundaries of Manitoba and making half a dozen other changes in the boundaries of Ontario, Quebec and other provinces, he would support it. But the hon. gentleman must not forget that we have no powers to deal indiscriminately with the dividing lines between provinces. There is an Act of the imperial parliament regulating matters of this kind; and, before we do anything about changing our neighbours' land mark, we must consider that statute that we may comply with it. It reads as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

When the Prime Minister speaks of consulting Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and the other provinces whose territory is likely to be affected by any changes in boundaries made in that part of the country he is talking of doing what it is his bounden duty