

advanced by them or any hon. gentleman opposite why these lands should not be handed over is that there would be a conflict with the Dominion Immigration Department in filling and settling up that country. I think the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) said that he thought these lands should be retained by the government here for a few years and then handed over to the provinces. Why this delay? Is it because they are in power and anxious to maintain their power by means of a political machine or is it because the hon. member wants to state to this country that the people in those provinces to-day are not fit to exercise the same measure of self-government that belongs to all the other provinces but one in this Dominion? What were his reasons? Why are these lands detained to-day? The member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) says that there would likely be a conflict, but I have pointed out before in this House that when he was in opposition, when the Conservative administration was in power, there was no man in Manitoba who advocated more effectually or more often, that the lands of Manitoba should be handed over to that province than the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). Thus, I say, that I think the people in that country are entitled to some further explanation as to why these lands are being withheld than has been given by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. TURRIFF. The hon. member is mistaken in saying that I advocated handing over the lands to the provincial government. What I stated on every occasion was that in the deal that we should make on provincial autonomy, we would either be entitled to the lands or to a fair compensation for them, and the reason I am supporting this Bill and this clause—and supporting it heartily—is because I consider that we are getting a compensation in lieu of lands that is better for the province than handing over the lands to the province; what we are getting is a net revenue paid semi-annually in advance, so that we know exactly what we get and we get it for all time, and the Dominion government will, as has been pointed out if they choose to handle these lands from a revenue point of view, be able to recoup themselves for the subsidy they are giving in lieu of lands. I may say further that I have had hundreds of letters from my constituents since the Bills were introduced, and I have not had one letter from any gentleman in my own constituency objecting to the terms in lieu of lands or suggesting that we should have the lands instead of a subsidy that it is proposed to give.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentlemen from the west are like Saul of Tarsus; they have seen a great light, and instead of slaying the demon they are now

ready to accept the situation. They were in favour of the provinces having these lands; why are they not true to their principle? It seems to be characteristic of a Liberal that once he has a principle he must abandon it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Like Paul of Tarsus.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They do not choose to be Paul; they are always Saul. Do hon. gentlemen from the west pretend to say that a definite proposition, which would give a sufficient amount of ready money for these provinces, could not be evolved, based on the provinces taking over these lands. I am quite sure that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), if he had a conference with the representatives of these provinces, could evolve a financial policy which allow the provinces to have the lands and give enough ready money for all their requirements. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would be prepared to do it any day. I am in favour of those provinces receiving those lands and administering them and of evolving a financial policy based on the land which would give them lots of ready money; and I do regret to notice that how ready are those Liberals to abandon their principles whenever these principles come in collision with some question of expediency and of holding office. Surely they ought to elect to stand by their principles and by the Territories instead of coming down here and promising everything and then doing nothing. What is it they have not promised with regard to the school question and a financial arrangement with the new provinces. If there was ever a champion of national schools in this country, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was that man. He made his reputation on that question. He got into this government on it and expects to achieve higher honours still. But he has abandoned all he ever said about national schools in Manitoba and has swallowed the mixture prepared for him without a protest. I never saw a more humiliating spectacle in this House than that presented the other day in that little duel between the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). I do not know what influence was exerted, but the spectacle presented was not a satisfactory one for the country. Neither will the country be satisfied with the spectacle presented to-day by these hon. gentlemen opposite who for years have been going up and down the Northwest asking, arguing that the lands should absolutely belong to the people of that country, inasmuch as the provinces were competent to administer those lands and should be given the same status as the other provinces. But now these same gentlemen say that they were

Mr. M. S. MCCARTHY.