

All crown lands, mines and minerals and royalties incident thereto shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada, subject to the provisions of any Act of the parliament of Canada with respect to road allowances and roads or trails as in force immediately before the coming into force of this Act, which shall apply to the said province with the substitution therein of the said province for the Northwest Territories.

2. The Rocky Mountains Park shall continue to be subject to the provisions of the Acts of the parliament of Canada applying thereto, and to regulations made or to be made under any such Act: Provided that the provincial laws shall apply to and be operative within the said park so far as they are not inconsistent with such Acts and regulations.

Mr. LAKE. I purpose moving an amendment having in view the carrying out of the principles of confederation in regard to the provincial ownership of Crown lands. A good deal of discussion has already taken place on this matter, and I do not consider it necessary to say very much more now. The British North America Act is very explicit and precise in regard to the distribution of legislative authority as between the Dominion and the provinces. There are certain rights and powers assigned to the provinces. An organized territory without full provincial powers is in my opinion a territory still, and not a province in the full meaning of the word. If the word 'province' is to be retained in these Bills the ordinary rights and powers of a province ought to be given to these new organizations. It seems to me that comparatively little change is being made in the status of these two territories, and that the two so-called provinces will be provinces merely in name and not in actual fact. That being so they should have some distinctive name applied to them to distinguish their status from the status of the older provinces. I have protested on a former occasion against depriving these new districts of the ordinary rights and powers enjoyed by the older provinces of the Dominion. I have said that the designs of confederation cannot be said to have been successfully accomplished when there are two grades of provinces existing in the Dominion: upper and lower grade provinces. A confederation in which a citizen has greater rights in one province than in another cannot be enduring. I contend that when a Canadian goes from the province of Quebec or of Ontario to reside in Alberta he should not be deprived of any of the rights of his citizenship. One of the essential attributes of a province is the possession of its public lands. It has been the fashion during the debate on this Bill to criticise the fathers of confederation; I do not join in that criticism. I consider that the principle of the possession by the provinces of the public lands within their limits, was one of the wisest provisions adopted by the fathers of

confederation. Sir John Macdonald, in advocating this principle, said it was:

One of the chief advantages of the federal union and of local legislatures, that each province will have the power and means of developing its own resources and aiding its own progress after its own fashion and its own way.

Sir A. T. Galt, speaking at the same time, said:

We may place just confidence in the development of our resources, and repose in the belief that we shall find in our territorial domain, our valuable mines, and our fertile lands, additional sources of revenue far beyond the requirements of the public service.

Not very long ago the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), in advocating this same principle used an expression which I thought a very apt one. He spoke of the principle of the possession of the public lands by the province as the very keystone of the whole scheme. In some strange manner he appears lately to have changed his opinion on that subject. The control and administration of the public domain as well as the beneficiary interest in it should be in the hands of the same authorities as those who have to open up internal communications and meet local services, such as roads, bridges, fireguards, water supply, and so on. No different treatment should be meted out to Alberta and Saskatchewan than has been meted out to the older provinces. The management of the land by the local government would be immensely more convenient to the people, who are settling those vast areas and converting them from their wild state to the needs and uses of civilization, than management from a centre thousands of miles away. Abuses and mismanagement are more easily remedied on the spot by a body of direct representatives all with an intimate knowledge of local requirements and local conditions, than by this parliament, such a small proportion of whom have any local knowledge, and many of whom take small interest in that country. The local administration would bring greater satisfaction and contentment to the settlers—always a most important factor in inducing immigration. I have on a previous occasion pointed out the utterly inadequate compensation being made for the loss of the public domain. Other provinces will be rich and prosperous and able to develop their resources by the judicious administration of their public domain when Alberta and Saskatchewan are having to resort to direct taxation for the ordinary purposes of local government. One excuse that has been urged is the difference of the position of the original provinces in regard to their lands at confederation and the two territories with which we are now dealing. The former were spoken of as sovereign colonies, at the time in full possession of their own lands. I submit that it is not true statesmanship to make this distinction. The