

why these provinces should be deprived of the great land possessions which lie within their borders, either as regards financial terms or immigration.

But, judge yourself what pride, what hope, what energy would be given to the great province of Alberta or Saskatchewan if it knew it had these millions of fertile acres, that it was the manager of them, that it was the trustee for its future citizens, and that out of that immense acreage, so vast and so rich a heritage, it could provide for all the wants of a great future and could administer its own. What a different feeling that would be from that which will arise when they look at the lands, at the timber, at the minerals and are compelled to say: We have nothing to do with these; they are here in our midst, and our police regulations, our municipal laws, our provincial administration conserves them and to a large extent adds to their value; but they do not belong to us, we are not permitted to have them or administer them. There is something in the pride of a country as in the pride of a man. The settler who goes to northern Ontario and takes up 160 acres of land, is told: You may have this land, but of all the timber standing up on it you shall not have one stick except what you need to build your house and barn. And he feels: This is not my farm; I have the surface soil, but what grows upon it does not belong to me. And is he satisfied? No, he is not and will not be. He has not the pride of a man who owns what he uses. The same pride and the same energy that ownership inspires would give more intense life to the province that has its complete birth-right. Now, my remarks have been crude; and they may meet with favour or they may not. But such as they are, Mr. Chairman, you and hon. members on the other side of the House are perfectly welcome to them.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has taken some credit to himself—and I think he is entitled to it—for not having made a partisan speech. I wish I could congratulate him on making a speech that would tend to good understanding and goodwill throughout the Dominion. I think there can be only one conclusion reached by those who have heard the remarks of the hon. member, and that is, that he was most anxious to create dissatisfaction between the new provinces with the terms that have been granted them, and likewise to create dissatisfaction in the old provinces for the same reason.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) may say that I was anxious to do that, and I could say there was not the least trace of that anxiety in my mind. I wanted to show what were the absolute results of the policy that is being carried out. But I had no desire to sow dissension in Edmonton.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps I have made a mistake in suggesting the hon. gentleman's motive.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may say that my remarks will have that effect, but certainly that was not what I had in mind.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I wished to say; and I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for giving me the right words. I think it will be agreed that that must be the effect of his remarks, so far as they have effect. I thought that the most regrettable feature of the argument was that which laid great stress on the assumption that the people of the west were deprived of their control of the timber, lands and minerals because these things were held in the ownership of the Dominion. The people of the west are citizens of the Dominion, and the ownership of these lands by the Dominion is not less ownership by the west than if that ownership rested with the provincial government. I think it is a pity that, in the stress of argument in this House, such ideas should be advanced, especially in the forceful, energetic and logical way which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) has at command. It would be most unfortunate if the people of the west should be educated into the idea that in any way they were not citizens of the Dominion, sharing in all the liberties, all the rights, all the properties of the Dominion, as they certainly do. It matters not so much whether these properties are administered by the provincial or by the Dominion government, so they be well administered, so the policy and administration is in the best interest of all the provinces. In this case it seems to me what is in the interest of the country must be in the interest of the province, and what is in the interest of the province must be in the interest of the country.

I have one criticism to offer on the point of view taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). That point of view is the same that has been taken so persistently by our friends on the other side of the House. They insist on treating this question of ownership of the lands and dealing with the lands as a matter of revenue rather than of as a matter of development. Now, in my estimation that is where they are absolutely at variance with the whole spirit of the west. The spirit of the west is that, whether these lands are given away or sold, or whatever shall be done with them, the object and aim shall be the development of those resources, the bringing of those resources into active use; the main object is not to derive a sum of money for their sale.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will permit me I would like to ask a question. I understood distinctly from his predecessor (Mr. Sifton) that the policy of this government was to make a revenue