

America Acts from 1867 to 1886 inclusive. Taking that point of view, I endeavoured to point out to the hon. gentleman that his own suggestion involved the most violent invasion of provincial autonomy I had ever heard any body give voice to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where does the hon. gentleman find any provision in the British North America Act that substantiates anything he has said just now? He says that my proposal involves some invasion of provincial autonomy; what section or subsection of the British North America Act is he referring to?

Mr. SCOTT. It is clear to every person that the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario own their public domain, they are entirely unrestricted in the usage of their public domain, it is their chief source of revenue. The province of Nova Scotia gets much more from its public domain than it does from the federal subsidy, so with the province of Ontario, so with the province of Quebec. My hon. friend's suggestion was, if I understood him right, that we were not free to deal with these new provinces with regard to the lands in any other way than those four provinces were dealt with; but then, he said, if there is a reasonable objection against that, why not put in this restriction? 'Would it not be the statesmanlike thing to find a way of adopting the power of the provinces in their disposal of these lands,' he suggested. As I pointed out in my speech on the second reading, it would be a restriction that would amount to scores of millions of dollars to come.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If he regards that as an invasion of provincial autonomy, does he regard it as a greater invasion of provincial autonomy to retain the lands altogether by the Dominion?

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend knows my view with regard to the proposals which are before the House. My view is that this parliament has the discretion to give such constitution to these new provinces as it chooses to give. We are proposing to pay a certain amount of money to them in lieu of their public domain. I have been out in that country recently and have conversed with scores of men who take an interest in this question, and they all agree with me that this proposal is far better for the provinces even than the proposal to transfer the land unrestrictedly to the new provinces, and that as between the proposal that is being put into effect and the suggestion to turn over the public domain with my hon. friend's restriction, there is no comparison at all. With respect to the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle going to show that the people of the Northwest are not satisfied with these land proposals, I asked him a moment ago, I ask him again now, and I

ask the member for South York, if they are in earnest in what they say about these land proposals, why did they not take the opportunity to go into the district of Edmonton and place their policy before the people of that district? Surely they had a fine opportunity of placing their views with regard to the land question as well as the school question before the people of Edmonton? But I understand they hold that it was no use to go, because there are a number of Roman Catholics in the district of Edmonton, and Roman Catholics forsooth, have no right to express an opinion upon the constitutional questions involved in this Autonomy Bill. But whatever reasons may underlie their contentions as to Roman Catholics and schools, surely as regards lands the interests of the Roman Catholic and Protestant citizens of the Northwest must be identical. And let me say here that this land proposition, in the judgment of the people of the Northwest Territories, is a much more serious, a much more momentous question than is the question that divides my hon. friend from Carleton and myself with regard to separate schools. There is a certain question between him and myself as to whether the settler out there shall have the privilege to send his child to a school-house on section 11 or to a school-house on section 14. But the settler in the Northwest Territories is more concerned to know whether he is going to have money enough to educate his child either in the school-house on section 14 or in the school-house on section 11, than in the minor question as to which section his child shall travel to in going to the school-house. Very recently, in company with some of my hon. friends from the Territories and the new Minister of the Interior, I spent three weeks in the Northwest Territories, I was up in the constituency of Edmonton, passed through the constituency of Strathcona, spent four or five days in the district of Calgary, came through my own district, and put two days in at Regina. During that time I conversed with scores, if not with hundreds, of gentlemen, perhaps most of them Liberals, as would naturally be the case, but with a great many Conservatives also, and not a single man of them raised any objection against the land proposition of these measures. Many of the gentlemen I spoke to, Liberals, independents and Conservatives, some of them Conservative members of the legislature, spoke to me in strong terms of approval of the measures before the House at the present time in particular relation to the lands.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. When the Bill was up for the second reading, I took the opportunity of opposing this particular clause relating to the financial terms. I think there are very good reasons why these clauses should be opposed. I have listened during the afternoon and evening to hon. gentlemen