

of Manitoba was given to understand then that she need never go back for anything more, and the Manitoba legislature accepted that settlement and passed legislation agreeing to it. I venture to say that if we had received different treatment, if we had received any kind of liberal treatment, the province of Manitoba would never have been the disturbing element in the Dominion which she has been.

Then we had another disturbing question, the question of monopoly. Hon. gentlemen will remember that a monopoly was given the Canadian Pacific Railway, which deprived the province of Manitoba of the right to grant charters for railways built in that province for some 20 years. That caused an agitation which far exceeds the school agitation and almost resulted in open rebellion.

We then had this settlement called the Better Terms Deal in Manitoba, over which they was very strong agitation. The Liberals fought hard against it, but our Conservative friends who occupied the Treasury benches in that province agreed to it and practically accepted it as a final deal.

Later on we had the school question, but all those agitations were not due to the Liberal party. The whole responsibility must be charged to the Conservative party which was then in power here and in the province of Manitoba, and which had the support of our hon. friends opposite.

In connection with the land situation, I would just say that I believe the government are making the best possible arrangement. The lands possibly belong to the provinces and so do the timbers and the minerals. The provinces are not getting their timber or mines and there has not been a word said about that, although one would fancy those came within provincial rights, but the only questions that seem to be causing any agitation are the control of the lands and the school question. I think it would be a great mistake for this parliament to leave the control of the lands entirely in the hands of the provinces. As I have said, so far as Manitoba is concerned, there would never have been any question of provincial rights if the same liberal terms had been given Manitoba which are now being extended to the Territories. And the reason I claim that it would not be wise to leave the control of the lands to the new provinces is this, namely, that a different system of management would no doubt likely take place very soon. What would this mean, not only to the provinces themselves, but the whole Dominion? In the consideration of this question we must bring business ideas into operation. We must consider not merely the two provinces themselves but the whole country. The building up of the Northwest Territories should not be retarded in any way. We cannot afford to allow any obstacles to be thrown in the way of immigration because

that would be a detriment to the whole Dominion. Take the province of Ontario, what does it mean to Ontario to-day to have 100,000 or 200,000 people going into our Northwest? It means the building up of more factories down here and the employment of more labour. We are prospering now and cannot afford to take any chances. We cannot afford to run the risk of having that land policy changed, which is really our great drawing card at present. We must continue our present policy. We must let the people of the world know that the policy in operation now, we are going to continue for some time to come. If we were to change that policy we would very seriously retard the flow of immigration, and those new provinces would not go on and prosper as they ought to do. I think that the leader of the opposition went so far as to say that some kind of a deal might be made with these provinces, under which homestead conditions might still exist, but I say that if we are to hand over those lands to the provinces, we must give them out and out. Either we should part with the sole control or keep it. But if we keep control and carry on the system now in operation, it is hard to realize what that will mean to Canada and what it means at present. The opposition claim that possibly the management would be as good under provincial control as under Dominion control. That might be, but what has been our experience in Manitoba? We had no free lands in Manitoba but we had a lot of cheap lands, and what happened there? Instead of keeping these cheap lands for the settlers which would be some inducement for settlers to come into the province of Manitoba, very shortly after the change of government took place the policy of the Liberal government of Manitoba of holding the lands and giving them to the settlers was departed from and these lands, of which there were nearly one million acres, were turned over to companies, to speculators, at a low price and now, instead of these lands being sold to settlers at \$1.50 to \$3 an acre, as they were under the Manitoba Liberal government's scheme of immigration, they are held by speculators and companies at from \$5 to \$10 an acre. This raising of the price of lands has practically stopped immigration into Manitoba and there is that same danger in the west. Only last fall the Manitoba government turned over 256,000 acres of land to a company at \$1.56 an acre and within a few days, almost before the lands were transferred, they were resold for \$4 an acre and possibly these lands, which are fairly fit for settlement, are held to-day for from \$6 to \$10 an acre. The same conditions might be permitted in the new Territories. The people of Canada cannot afford to take any chances in a matter of this kind. The prosperity of the whole Dominion depends largely on the management of the lands in that western country, and any change in that management would

Mr. CRAWFORD.