

up to the end of the thirty-fifth year with a total amount of \$59,301,250, roughly \$60,000,000 in the thirty-five years. I venture to say that the provinces, even if they obtained the land unreservedly and carried out the free homesteading intention to a reasonable extent, and the settlement policy which is in force at the present time, could not hope to obtain such an amount of money in that period. We heard the leader of the opposition say the other day that his suggestion to hand the lands over to the provinces with a restriction as to prices, was only an alternative suggestion,—that it was only in the event of there being danger in doing otherwise that he would ask the people of the province to consent to accept the lands and give an agreement to continue the free homestead policy with regard to the even numbered sections and the low-settlement-price policy with regard to the odd numbered sections. Well, Sir, it struck me as peculiar that the hon. gentleman was willing to invade provincial autonomy to that extent, and that he should be unwilling to do the same thing with regard to schools. Now, I say in all sincerity that I think the people would much more readily agree to the limitation upon their autonomy that is being put upon them in relation to the subject of education, than they would be willing to agree to such a limitation of their autonomy as the leader of the opposition has suggested with regard to their substantial resources.

Mr. SPROULE. They would like freedom in both.

Mr. SCOTT. The verdict of Edmonton was not to that effect, as I have pointed out. If there was any reason to prevent hon. gentlemen going to Edmonton to lay down their school policy, that reason could not apply with regard to the land policy, because the interests of Roman Catholics and Protestants must be precisely identical with regard to the lands. The sentiment of the people of the Northwest is that the school question which we have discussed is a very immaterial matter. The letter that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) read the other evening, and which he said came from a prominent Liberal in his district, is a proof that the people of the Northwest Territories consider the school issue as being an immaterial matter, they consider the land question as far more important. If there is any difference of opinion in the Northwest Territories, the matter of the land is looked upon as a very much more serious one than the matter of the schools. There was no reason in the world why the hon. gentlemen should not have gone up to Edmonton and presented their land policy. Some hon. gentlemen rather jeered when I mentioned Edmonton. What objection have they against the verdict of the people of Edmonton? Is it not a fact that the leader of the opposition, before the Minister of

Mr. SCOTT.

the Interior was appointed, got up himself and suggested that the district of Edmonton was a proper district in which to ask for a verdict of the people of the Northwest Territories upon the question of autonomy?

Mr. SPROULE. In the language of the boy on the street, that is too thin.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been listening ever since this debate commenced two months ago to try if possible to get at the reasons why members from the Northwest, including the present Minister of the Interior, were not in favour of the provinces having their own public lands; and so far as I can see now one of the chief reasons has been defined by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Scott). They would like to have the lands, they would like to have the whole outfit for the provinces, but they do not like to assume the responsibilities. They want to be men full grown, but they don't quite know whether they could walk if they were left alone. They would like to have the full birthright, but the little mess of pottage which is handed out to them just now is so enticing that they would rather lap that up and let the future take care of itself. Now the financial policy and the land policy are closely joined. The speech that has been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat shows that if it was not for the financial difficulty he would like to take the lands, and the west would like to have their lands, would like to be full-blooded in that respect, have all their rights, but they don't quite see how they could raise the money for the present and current expenses of the provincial governments. My objection to the matter as it stands is on two grounds, first, because these terms are not arranged on any ground of principle. There is no well grounded principle upon which the whole financial system with reference to these two provinces has been reared. The other ground of objection is that there is no finality to it. I think every member on either side of this House, must feel that there is no finality in this arrangement. Neither province will be satisfied if it does not have what really belongs to it. When either province is fully organized what will it have? It will have no control over its timber lands, it will have no control over its mineral lands, it will have no control over its prairie lands, it will have no control over its agricultural lands, it will have no control over its irrigable lands, it will have no control over its grazing lands. What is there but the mere skeleton of a province, in so far as regards the vast possessions which are yet undeveloped in each one of these territories? Not over a single acre or foot of all the soil which is yet unalienated will either of these provinces have any rights at all, so far as these rights are concerned in ownership. What have they, then? They have the name of