

ing these new provinces to handle the lands themselves. They are more interested in getting good settlers than we can possibly be, because it is they who will suffer if settlement is retarded. Looking at it from every standpoint, I do not see what we have to gain by administering the lands from here. After all the money is gone, which we will get from the sales of lands in the future, we will have to dip into the Dominion treasury to pay the running expenses in connection with the management of lands in the Northwest, so that to continue the present policy would be suicidal, if only from a financial standpoint. There are many other considerations I might dwell upon, such as the giving away of vast coal lands. Last fall a large area was given away at \$1.25 an acre and other large areas handed over to companies at insignificant sums. That is a policy which ought to be stopped. If these coal lands are not of any value we might as well hand them over to the Territories. We might as well do that in any event for all that we are getting for them. To say that the new provinces would squander and mismanage the lands is an insult to the people. The only good reason advanced so far is that advanced by the First Minister, that the provinces might be in distress for money; but I do not think that these local governments, which will have the same ability to borrow as other local governments, need be in any want of money, and we can as well afford to give them a reasonable monetary annual payment as we can to the other provinces. The other provinces have their lands and yet get an annual subsidy of so much per head. Why not treat the Territories in like manner? They should be given the same rights as the older provinces and be treated with as much fairness and consideration, and I have not yet heard any good reason why this should not be done.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman should have been a chancery lawyer, for once he gets a ward in chancery, he wants to keep it there all his life. Evidently that is his intention in the case of these new provinces. He wishes to keep them as wards in chancery and to manage their affairs for all time. He did tell us, when he introduced these Bills, that he was putting on the coping stone, that he was completing the emancipation of that country, but evidently his intention is to keep the west in the condition of wards for all time. The new provinces are not to be free to administer their own public lands but are to be treated as wards and the Dominion is to be their perpetual trustee. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman is more anxious about the patronage than anything else and thinks that his sunny measures will be promoted by having this large patronage at his disposal. I am surprised at the moderation of my own views in the matter of paternal government when I see this governments poposition, which is

paternalism in its rankest form. There is to be no emancipation of the provinces, no provincial rights, no trusting the people of the west to manage their own affairs. They are instead to be managed by the Dominion and the control of their own financial heritage is to be taken out of their hands. Again I would ask the right hon. gentleman to answer the question proposed by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), with regard to this new territory in Keewatin. If it is to be divided up among the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario, is Ontario to be given a deed to the Crown lands it takes over and are the other provinces to be still in the position of wards and not to be given control of these lands?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I intended to answer the question of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, but did not understand exactly what it was.

Mr. LAKE. The question I put is this. If the lands of Keewatin are to be divided among the provinces of Ontario and Manitoba and the new province of Saskatchewan, will the lands, which are to be included in the province of Ontario, be placed absolutely in the possession of that province? If that be the intention, will the same treatment be meted out to Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and will they enter into full possession of those lands? It seems to me that unless Ontario were placed in full possession of her slice of territory, the government might find that the precedent they are now setting would create a demand on the part of Ontario for a subsidy in lieu of these lands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must say to my hon. friend that I had not considered this aspect of the question. There was no necessity, I believe, for the government to come to any decision upon this point, especially in view of the manner in which the subject was brought up. My hon. friend is aware that when we brought down this Bill we did not include in Saskatchewan the whole of the area included in that territory. The territory in Keewatin is also claimed by the province of Manitoba. And I have no doubt, from the representations made to me that the province of Saskatchewan will also claim that portion of the territory. The province of Ontario has signified its intention to claim that its boundaries should be extended to the shores of Hudson bay. Under these circumstances the government decided not to dispose of the territory, but to wait and have a conference with the representatives of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, with a view to disposing of this territory. I am not prepared to say, at the present time, what the government should do. The only thing I can say, speaking for the government, is that we think it fair and just that the representations of these several provinces should be heard before a decision is come to.