

calculation that has been made in regard to the land. I find that the province of Ontario with a population of two and a quarter millions in the year 1902, derived from its lands \$1,499,000.

We find, by the arrangement that has been made with these Northwest provinces, that when their population reaches that of the province of Ontario, they will be deriving two and a quarter millions in respect of their lands. I have given the total amounts which the provinces referred to derive from their lands as they are to-day. I have deducted nothing for the expense of management, and I have not said, what is the fact, that these provinces are drawing from their capital account while the Territories are taking only their annual revenue. That the provinces, selling their lands, disposing of their natural resources, as they do to-day, and using the proceeds as their annual revenue, must find that revenue decreasing from year to year, while we, with not a cent deducted for expense of management or for any other purpose, find our revenue increasing from period to period according to the increase of population, until we reach a very fair maximum amount and when that is reached, there will be people settled all over these provinces, and they will have the means of revenue from taxation which exist in the older provinces. Our position will be similar, and we shall be able to carry on business as they do. Under these circumstances the objections which I entertained to provincial autonomy, and which were shared by a large majority of the people of the Territories, have been overcome by the financial terms offered to these provinces in the Autonomy Bill. We are just as ready to take upon ourselves all the rights and responsibilities of self-government as the people of any other part of this Dominion, but we want the means wherewith to discharge those responsibilities before we assume them. We are not going into any blind pool—the term seems objectionable to the leader of the opposition. We are giving our sanction to a definite bargain, laid down in dollars and cents, in regard to which there can be no equivocation or misunderstanding.

In regard to the educational clauses of the Bill, I do not know whether I dare venture on a subject which has been so thoroughly threshed out by so many legal gentlemen in this House already. But at the same time the laws are not all made by the lawyers, and they are not all administered upon the lawyers. It is the people at large who suffer from the laws, and it is not any harm for one of the ordinary citizens of the country to attempt to understand them. Now, on this point I differ very radically from some of my friends. I am not a supporter of separate schools because I like the principle of separate schools. I do not agree with everything that was said by

Mr. OLIVER.

our hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) last night—said so ably and so well. I am one of those who pin their faith unreservedly to a system of national schools, established for the purpose of educating the people of the country, of imparting to them knowledge in secular subjects. I am one of those who believe that religion can best be taught by those whose special training is the teaching of religion, that geography can be better taught by those whose special training is for the purpose of teaching geography. If I understood the law as some of our friends understand it, I certainly would vote against the educational provisions of this Bill. But I do not understand the law that way, and I am at a loss to see how they can understand it that way. We have been bombarded here for some time with petitions in regard to this educational question; we have seen staring headlines in the papers; there have been indignation meetings held in some parts of the country; there has been trouble, large, long and loud, all around; and what has it all been about? I noticed a heading in a newspaper the other day, a great large heading—I think it has been in several issues of the paper. It read: 'A Free West, a Common School, Provincial Rights, Religious Equality.' I hear some gentlemen laugh sarcastically. I want to say that I subscribe thoroughly to the sentiments expressed in that headline. I read further: 'Toronto Vigorously Protests Against Throttling the West.' Well, I would like to be understood as protesting against any attempt to throttle the west. 'Meeting emphatically protests against the enactment of section 16 or any other provisions inconsistent with their constitutional freedom in this regard.' And the mass meeting in Massey Hall demanded that the government, first should abandon the clauses, second, should appeal to the country, or third, should defer action—it must do one or other of these three things. I read in one of these petitions which have been sent in:

At the last regular meeting of the Strathcona Preceptory, Royal Black Knights of Ireland, the following motion was passed:

Moved Sir Knight J. J. Mellon, seconded Sir Knight T. Irving, that this preceptory does utterly disapprove of the school clause in the present Autonomy Bill, and strongly urge that the new provinces do have full control in all matters pertaining to education in the said provinces.

I find in a petition which I had the honour to present:

We, the undersigned electors of the electoral district of Edmonton do pray that in granting provincial autonomy to the Northwest Territories the Dominion parliament will not by any enactment or otherwise withhold from the newly created provinces full and unrestricted freedom of action in all matters affecting the es-