

much comment; although in my opinion they have received, and are receiving the warmest support of the majority of the people of Canada. Nevertheless the land clause, and especially the educational clause, have encountered very bitter opposition from some quarters.

With regard to the lands, it has been stated by the hon. leader of the opposition, in that very able statement which he presented to us the other day, that it was important and in accordance with the principles of the constitution that the lands of the Northwest Territories should be handed over to the new provinces. Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to that view of the question, because I believe that it is the part of wisdom for this government to retain control of the lands, apart from the consideration which was offered to us the other day by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), that, from the point of view of an effective immigration policy, it was not wise to have two or more governments dealing with it. There is another consideration, and that is the following: The moment you hand over to the new provinces the control of their lands, you leave them face to face with two propositions, which, I believe, are contrary to each other—the creating of a revenue and the maintaining of an efficient immigration policy. The new provinces, if possessed of the lands, would naturally be deprived of the financial aid extended to them by this government in lieu of the lands. They would have to create their revenue from those lands; and the moment you increase the price of land you hamper immigration, while if you want to promote immigration you have to decrease the price of land.

I have heard some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have the control of their lands. Very true, Mr. Speaker; but the provinces of Ontario and Quebec should not be considered from the same point of view as the Northwest provinces, and I will tell you why. Because there are in those two provinces immense timber limits, from which they derive a very large revenue. In the province of Quebec, during the last year, I think the revenue accruing from the Crown lands amounted to \$600,000—not from the sale of lands, but from the stumpage only. The situation is not the same in the Northwest Territories.

There is another point of view from which I think we should withhold the lands from the new provinces, that is the national point of view. In stating this opinion, I may be taxed by some hon. gentlemen with being a Utopist; I may be told that I am dreaming; but let me say frankly what I think. It is obvious to every one who observes the Northwest Territories to-day that the loyal sentiment which prevails there is pure, deep and large, as the stately rivers which run over the endless prairies. But who knows what will be the immigration of

to-morrow? There are to-day half a million people in the Northwest Territories; how many will you find in twenty or thirty years from now? Who can tell? Perhaps two million, perhaps three million, perhaps five million, perhaps ten or twelve million; and as we know that the largest foreign immigration to-day is from the United States, who can assure this House and this country that the control of the legislatures in the two new provinces thirty years from now will not be in the hands of people having a greater interest in the country to the south of the boundary line? And, Mr. Speaker, we shall have, in the control of the lands and in the control of immigration, perhaps not a complete remedy, but certainly a palliative. Hon. gentlemen opposite say to us: Hands off the twins; let them enjoy the greatest liberty; give them all their lands and the largest possible autonomy. Well, I can assure my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), whom I am glad to see in his seat, that in that future time, if he wishes, in order to maintain a loyal sentiment in the Northwest Territories, the services of that Roman Catholic clergy, whom he does not appear to like very much, they will be found as usual ready to support, day and night, through weeks and months and years, the British flag.

Mr. SPROULE. I may tell my hon. friend that, contrary to his opinion or belief, I do not dislike them by any means. I have no feeling of dislike against them.

Mr. BELAND. I am very glad to hear it. Coming to what is known in the country as the educational clause of this Bill, it is a very burning question and a question of very great importance. The agitation which has been aroused over that clause is immense, and we all regret it. That agitation is so intense that we are told that the provincial government of Manitoba, now on its last legs, is seeking to get a new lease of office out of it. Well, the educational clauses of this measure have already been discussed a good deal in this country. They have encountered very bitter opposition from the newspapers, especially in that enlightened city of Toronto, where even men who used to be ranked amongst the foremost Liberals have been outspoken in their opposition to those clauses, and they have also enjoyed the distinction of being made the subject of the censorious tongues of those who adorn the pulpits of this country. There are many points of view from which this important question may be considered. There is the constitutional point of view, there is the provincial autonomy point of view; but whatever may be the reasons invoked in this debate, the main object of those who are making to-day a solid opposition to these educational clauses is nothing else but political capital. Before proceeding further, I must say that I was very much surprised the other night when I heard the eloquent member for West As-

Mr. BELAND.