

mean a stopping of immigration. A stopping of immigration into this country would mean the stopping of trade and the stopping of trade would mean probably the loss of millions of dollars annually to the people of Canada. We cannot afford to let anything creep in that will change the present conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the present government sold 250,000 acres of that land for \$1 an acre to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and that the company is selling to the outside public at from \$5 to \$10, so that just what he thinks would be ruinous has taken place?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The hon. gentleman is a little off in his ideas as to that transaction if he compares it with the transaction that I have been mentioning in Manitoba. In Manitoba these transfers of land have been made without any conditions at all. In the sale of the 250,000 acres in the Territories which were sold to this company, conditions were attached. The company is obliged to place so many settlers in each township. It is part of the bargain and they put up a guarantee of \$50,000 that they would do this.

Mr. SPROULE. Did they live up to it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand they did.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not the evidence given before the committee here. When the officers were asked the question: Have they complied with that? The answer by the agent was: I do not think they have; we have not made an actual count but we do not think they have. Yet they were selling the land. Where there were twenty settlers to be put in each township the inspector did not ascertain that these twenty settlers were put in the township before handing the land over, but if they found in a certain district that the aggregate number of settlers would amount to twenty in each township they regarded that as a compliance with the terms and the land was given over.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Possibly, what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says is correct; but it has nothing to do with the deal; that is a matter of management afterwards, and in our business heads here are not doing their duty and not making these people live up to their agreement they are not doing what is right and I would not defend them for a minute. So far as the transaction is concerned, it is altogether different from the transaction I am referring to in Manitoba. There is no comparison whatever. Let us look at the policy of the Conservative party in years gone by. Look at a map of the Territories to-day and you would almost think that the whole country was given away to railways as bonuses and to land companies for colonization purposes.

The only transaction on the part of this government to which the hon. gentleman can point is that one transaction of 250,000 acres, and to that settlement conditions were attached. But when the Conservatives were in office they were continually giving away the lands of the country and to-day in a charter which is still alive for the construction of a railway there is provision for a land grant of 12,800 acres a mile, about 60,000 square miles of land grant given by the Conservative government to this railway company. The whole management by that party seems to have consisted of dealing with companies, destroying the condition of things in the country, destroying the prospects of settlement. When I went to the west twenty-nine years ago the country was free to a very large extent; we could get homesteads and pre-empt adjoining land, but in a few years when the Canadian Pacific Railway was given a land grant by the Conservative party what happened? Every other section, some fifty or sixty million acres, was reserved from settlement and it was a hardship to the people of that country to bring those conditions into existence, and it drove thousands of people out of that country owing to the fact that settlement was so sparse that they could not establish schools and they were so scattered that the country was hardly habitable. Settlement was scattered and there was no prospect in the near future of getting near neighbours. I know different ones who left the country on that account, owing to the condition brought about by the land policy of our friends opposite who were then in power. The only transaction under this government to which my hon. friends can refer is this one of 250,000 acres and settlement conditions are attached to it.

I have occupied all the time that I feel I should occupy in this debate. I do not know that I have changed the opinion of many members of the opposition. I may say that I did not expect to do it when I started, and I do not suppose if I continued till morning that there would be any different result. If it costs Canada \$30 a minute to run this parliament, as I have heard it said, I think perhaps I have squandered about all the money I ought to at this time. I would say in conclusion that I have no hesitation in taking the position I do on this matter. The school law is good, in fact the best law possible, as some of our friends opposite have claimed. Now if that is the case, why should we not continue it, especially if by so doing we can cut out this agitation that has been going on for the last sixty years? In view of all the facts that I have set forth, I have no hesitation in supporting the government on this Autonomy Bill.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). In rising to place myself on record on this important Bill, I may say that after so many long and judicial addresses, I feel that I