

of the interests of those Northwest provinces was inaugurated by the Dominion government after these provinces were created, what would be the result? The worst that could happen the Dominion government would be that it might lose the representation of a majority of the seats in the Northwest provinces. But that would not mean the condemnation and fall of the administration. It could go on as before. It could go on and carry out that policy against the protests and against the wishes of the people whose rights had been interfered with. Is not the vital principle of governmental responsibility to the people more closely and more constitutionally applied when the lands of the Northwest are given over to the custody and control of the Northwest legislatures to administer as they may in their wisdom see? As the conditions change you will have of necessity a change in policy. If that were so would not that be direct control by the people? Would not that be direct control of the people by the people and for the people? Would not that be direct control by a legislature answerable to the people for its maladministration, because, if there were enacted in the provinces by the government, in regard to the administration of these lands, policies, which, in the opinion of the people, were destructive of the best and highest interests of the people, that government when it appealed to the people, would be swept from power, and a new policy, a new government representing the people would be inaugurated in its stead, the people's rights would be restored and the people would be carrying on a government which would not be the case if these lands were administered from Ottawa.

Another ground that was taken, and it was insisted upon by the hon. member for Brandon, was that the retention of the present land policy of the Dominion government was vitally essential for the due increase of population of the Northwest by immigration. I fail to see that that proposition, going that length, can justify the deprivation which we are inflicting on those provinces by taking away their lands. I fail to see why those Northwest provinces, if they are fit to be entrusted with the powers that we give them, are not capable of administering their lands. If they possess all the other powers of local government, I fail to see that they are not capable of carrying out, and carrying out successfully, such an immigration policy as is necessary for the filling up of those lands. I think those provinces are capable of carrying out an immigration policy sufficient for their purposes. I think that those provinces, represented by the men who are more closely in touch with the needs of their country than we could be, would be better able to fit such a policy to the changing and growing conditions of that country than

could be done by people two or three thousand miles away from their governments and legislatures. Autonomy is given to them by reason of their growth; autonomy is rendered necessary by reason of the expansion that has taken place in that country and by reason of the rapidity with which those lands are being settled upon; and yet the very reason that those lands are withheld from them is the immigration policy which is to settle those lands. It may well be suggested that the depriving of those provinces of their lands is shackling them very severely and in a manner which will cripple their operations in the future.

The right hon. gentleman cited the policy of the United States government in withholding the lands of the newly created states. That is one of the customs and laws of our neighbours which appeals to the right hon. gentleman. There are others which do not appeal to him; but he uses that as a precedent, because it is in accord with what he desires to pass on to the new provinces to be created in the Territories. But when it comes to other questions, questions involved in the same Bill, questions which have given rise to heart-burnings and strife and to expressions of great feeling by an aroused people, then we are warned against following in the footsteps of the United States, where there are such a number of lynchings and outlaws. It is one thing to have caution, it is another thing to know how to fit that caution properly to conditions which exist. I am therefore strongly of opinion that the conditions of affairs in these provinces require that in granting autonomy to them, it would be better and more satisfactorily worked out, and in that respect the Bill would be more cordially received by the people whose interests we have to serve, if the lands were to be granted to the provinces. If it be nothing more, it is a principle of justice which we owe to those Northwest provinces not to withhold from them the rights which appertain to the fulness of local autonomy, one of these being the administration of the lands in that domain.

Coming to the educational question, which is the vital question in the Bill, one is at once beset by the different constructions which have been placed, or which have been attempted to be placed, upon the statutes which have been invoked. We have heard it said that one statute represents the constitution, and that we are bound this way or bound that way. Sir, whether it be the Act of 1867 or the Act of 1871 or the Act of 1875 which governs the creation of these provinces, I submit that there is one special provision which does govern the rights of the provinces themselves. If by reading the Acts from 1867 to 1886 together we find that the provinces have the power to make laws with regard to education, why should we in this Bill deprive them of the right to

Mr. BOYCE.