

tion,' but from that fact I argued that, inasmuch as it was kept in the background, the people interested in such a matter should be heard before the parliament of Canada finally pass upon the question. Mr. Scott argues that because the issue was not discussed the people must be satisfied with the provisions of a Bill of which they then had no knowledge.

From this conclusion I must dissent, and I may say that, in the interests of a common, enlightened and progressive citizenship, I regret exceedingly that any school system which will segregate different sections of the population during the early years of their education, and give a different colouring to their civic and national ideals, is about to be fastened upon the people yet to inhabit our magnificent heritable in the Northwest.

I believe a solution of sectarian difficulties should be and will yet be possible, in the form of a system of Christian morality upon which all varieties of opinion may agree, to be taught in all the schools of the country.

S. D. CHOWN.

Toronto, April 1.

The hon. gentleman saw fit to refer to Mr. Bulyea. He wondered if Mr. Bulyea had been present with Mr. Haultain in his interviews with the leader of the opposition. Well, I know whereof I speak when I say that from the time the premier of the Territories came to Ottawa at the request of the leader of the government to discuss this question, until this Bill was introduced into this House, he absolutely refused to discuss it with any one, either Liberal or Conservative, because, as he said, he did not think it would be proper to enter into a discussion with anybody upon this question while he was negotiating with the government. But when this Bill was brought before parliament and its provisions made public, he considered he was no longer under any restraint, and has since discussed it with both Liberals and Conservatives, and as freely, frankly and thoroughly with the one as with the other.

I do not wish to trespass at any further length on the patience of the House. I simply desired more particularly to criticise the three leading features, the question of the boundary of Manitoba, the land question and the educational clauses. As to the first, I think I have convinced the House that the reasonable request of the province of Manitoba has been contemptuously treated. I see that the premier of Ontario, taking his cue from the right hon. gentleman's speech, has filed a claim for a certain portion of Keewatin, and also that the new Quebec premier has expressed his intention to make a similar requisition on behalf of that province. It is evident that the object of the right hon. gentleman is being accomplished, but in the meantime the people of Manitoba are in a state of unrest and excitement. As to the land policy, in my judgment the government have no reasonable ground, either from a constitutional point of view or from the point of view of public policy, in withholding those lands from the province. In my opinion also, the open let-

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

ter of the premier of the Northwest Territories, protesting against the manner in which the provisions of his draft Bill were disregarded, cavalierly treated and passed over, does not contain one expression which any reasonable man can attribute to partisanship, unless it be partisan to be consistent. But if abandoning the very things which Mr. Haultain had provided for in his draft Bill, and which had received the support of the territorial assembly, and even that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia; if abandoning every claim put forward on behalf of the Territories, be consistency, then I am willing to give the palm to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). As to the educational clauses, in my opinion they are an interference in matters of purely provincial concern. I believe them to be unconstitutional and impolitic. High legal authorities, such as Sir Louis Davies, judge of the Supreme Court, has declared that this parliament had not the right to interfere in the school policy of the Territories; and should this question ever come up before him for adjudication, he would, if he desired to be consistent, feel bound to give an opinion in accord with the views he expressed in parliament. I have here the opinion he expressed. It has been quoted in this House before, but you cannot emphasize a good opinion too frequently. This is what Sir Louis Davies said in 1891, when the territorial charter was under consideration:

My opinion is now, and has been for years, that when that time comes (the time to erect the Territories into provinces) you cannot withhold from the provinces so erected the right to determine for themselves the question of education in one way or the other. I would be the last to favour this parliament imposing upon the people there any system of education, either free or separate. I only claim that when a Bill is introduced to erect these Territories into provinces that Bill should contain a provision enabling the people of the different provinces so created to decide what system of education they will have.

Surely that opinion is not biased or coloured by Sir Louis Davies' political proclivities. Surely it was not given in order to advance the cause of the Conservative party. He takes the ground that parliament is not at liberty to interfere with the educational policy of those new provinces. The late Judge Mills, the former philosopher of the Liberal party, a man of high legal attainments, frequently quoted as a constitutional authority, both in this House and the Upper Chamber, and who was transferred to the Supreme Court before his death, also gave an opinion which is in accord with that of Sir Louis Davies. He said:

When the people of the Territories or any portion of the Territories are sufficiently numerous to constitute a province—when, in fact, they attain their majority in regard to local matters, and when they propose to set up for themselves—this parliament has no right to