

government shall have a one-fourth interest. This has been the case since, I believe, 1896.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not make any comment on that point. But I do not observe that the other reserves are statutory.

Mr. GALLIHER. What are they?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I read them—there are eight of them. For instance, there is the reservation of one-quarter of the water frontage; the reservation of the right to enter and take material for public buildings; the reservation of mining rights; and so on.

Mr. GALLIHER. The reservation of mining rights is covered under the Mining Act. And the Water Clauses Consolidation Act, I fancy, covers the other, but I am not prepared to speak definitely as to that. In my opinion, and, I cannot but think, in the opinion of any one who will view the question from a fair standpoint, there can be no fault found with any act done by the Dominion government or the Department of the Interior with relation to this matter that this House should cast censure upon or that should call forth the censure of the people of Canada or of the province of British Columbia.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I do not intend to spend very much time in dealing with this subject. I congratulate my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) on having simply discussed the question which was raised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). He was good enough to say that there were two branches to it, although, I think he himself showed pretty clearly that there was really only one. He said that there was a desire to have a rap at the Dominion government, and then he indicated what that rap should be administered for—the interference of the Dominion government in a purely provincial affair. That was exactly the ground stated by my hon. friend who introduced the discussion, and to that the hon. gentleman from Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) confines himself, not going beyond it in any way. I propose to do the same. But, one cannot help noticing that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) did not confine his remarks to the subject under discussion, but entered upon other ground.

He immediately took upon himself to condemn the provincial government led by Mr. McBride; he declared that it was a bad government and prophesied that it would speedily receive its deserts. It seems to me that that had nothing at all to do with the question raised by my hon. friend, that is a question of an entirely different nature. So far as the contention of my hon. friend and so far as my own contention is concerned, if there are any domestic questions in the province of British Colum-

Mr. GALLIHER.

bia as between the two parties there it seems to me it is proper for the two parties there to fight them out; that that is the arena in which the contest should take place and not here in the Dominion House. In the Dominion House, although the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) did not appear to see it, although I can hardly believe that he did not see it, the only question that was raised was a question of constitutional practice as regards the area and the scope of the powers of the Dominion government and of the provincial government and the doctrine that was laid down was the good old doctrine of the times of confederation, and, after confederation, up to about I think 1890 laid down by every leading Liberal who took a prominent part in public affairs of the Dominion of Canada, namely, that the province had its special area, had its special line of subjects, and that within that area it was independent and should be kept so; that the Dominion government had its special province, its line of subjects and that it was proper that it should keep to them and not be interfered with in its administration with reference to those subjects. The doctrine was involved in the question of a federal or a legislative union, and when the decision was favourable to a federal rather than to a legislative union it was upon that line that cleavage took place and it was with reference to that that an ultimate decision was come to. Now what we see is that of late, especially since my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken the leadership of the Liberal party and more especially since he has had the leadership of the Liberal government, that old doctrine has been set aside, has been condemned and the tendency has been continually towards a servile alliance of the provincial governments, a subjugated obedience on the part of the provincial governments to the Dominion government and as close and intimate an alliance as was possible to be got in mutual patronage, in mutual influence, and in mutual help, one to the other, irrespective entirely of the policies of the provinces, as distinct from the policy of the Dominion party and the rights of the provinces as distinguished from those that come within the Dominion's proper scope.

This is only one of many instances in which the right hon. gentleman who leads this government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has pressed matters under his administration. My hon. friend who spoke in the beginning of this discussion (Mr. R. L. Borden) instanced one or two notable examples where the Dominion Prime Minister absolutely interfered in the dictation of the choice of a premier and consequently of a government and of a policy in one of the provinces, in two provinces, it might have been said, that is in both of the far western provinces. Let us take the facts of the case as given by my hon. friend who spoke last. Here