

money for the sale of the land and hand it back to the provinces. Why don't you give them a quit claim to the land, and let the provinces take care of themselves? If they can take care of themselves, they can take care of their own land. This is a childish policy; it is as plain as A, B, C. Now, what will take place? I may not live to see the day, but the day will come when this government will receive no revenue from those lands, and then the government will say to the provinces: We cannot pay you any more, because we get nothing from you. Then they will say to this government: Why didn't you let us alone in the first place? Why did you rob us when we had something? Isn't it as broad as it is long? That is the way I understand it, anyway.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. member has put his finger on the weak spot of our opponents' argument. He suggests that the time will come when the revenues from the lands will not be equal to the subsidy in lieu of the land. However, he is mistaken when he suggests that at that time, if it arrives, this government will be able to say to the provinces: We don't get the money, and therefore we cannot give it to you. That is the advantage of this agreement to the people of the Northwest, that, whether that time arrives or not, if it ever does arrive, it will not be the privilege of this government to say that it will not pay that money, because it will have to pay that money whether it derives any revenue or not. That is why we are supporting this provision.

Mr. MORIN. Very well. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether the government proposes to act as a broker in this matter?

Mr. OLIVER. The government is not acting as a broker at all—

Mr. MORIN. Call it any other name you please.

Mr. OLIVER—because it is merely continuing to transact the business that it has always transacted, and the transaction of which has been successful and satisfactory; and the local government is going to continue to transact its business, in which its administration has been successful, but its revenues will be on a somewhat different basis from what they were before, and that is all the difference. I just want to make reference to a point mentioned by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) and also by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden), in reference to the revenue to be derived by the provinces, or that might be derived by the provinces in one instance, from the sale of coal lands, or royalties on coal and, in the other case, from the sale of the odd numbered sections of land. The hon. member for Carleton read an extract from a speech of the late Minister of the Interior, in which he suggested the idea that certain lands might be sold at the price,

Mr. MORIN.

as I understand the extract, of \$3 per acre. I am not able to say how far the late minister was laying down the policy for the future conduct of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He said that a measure would be introduced.

Mr. OLIVER. I will only say that the principle still remains the same, that this government can afford to give the lands away, and if it does not see fit to give the lands away it can afford to sell the lands to settlers better than the provincial government can afford to sell them if it has to sell them. He places the figures at \$3 an acre of the land to be sold when land to-day is being sold at \$6 per acre by railway companies. I submit that the provincial government under stress for revenue, as the government of every province in the Dominion is at the present time and as the governments of these provinces might very well be expected to be, would in the natural course of events, be apt to charge exactly what hon. members on the other side of the House have been suggesting during the whole of this day—the last cent the land was worth and wring the last cent they could get out of it for the purposes of revenue. That is the principle that hon. gentlemen opposite have laid down. That was not the principle laid down by the late Minister of the Interior. The principle was that there was a possibility of deriving a certain amount of money from the sale of land, but the price he suggested was under the present conditions, a low price, a price such as might be supposed not to be a bar to successful settlement. The same in regard to the sale of coal lands or royalties on coal. In their comparison between the existence of coal in Alberta and the existence of coal in Nova Scotia our hon. friends on the other side of the House do not seem to appreciate the source from which the value comes. Coal and land in themselves have no value. The value in the coal is in the market that may be got for the coal, and the value of the land is in the demand that exists for the land. If nobody wants the coal or the land the coal and the land are worth nothing. In Alberta we have hundreds of square miles of coal practically worth nothing, because there is no market for it. Therefore, a comparison between the revenue that may be derived from coal in Alberta and the revenue that is derived from coal in Nova Scotia is not a proper comparison.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is there not a market?

Mr. OLIVER. Because there is no great population dependent upon that source of supply. There will be, we hope, but there is not at the present time. To-day practically the area of coal land in the Edmonton districts is worth no more than ordin-