

lands, would amount to nothing—with perhaps the exception of very limited receipts arising from stumpage dues or timber limits and royalties on coal lands. Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the lands would be vested in the new provinces. What would happen? One of two things would have to be done—either issue free grants to the settlers or sell the lands. In the first instance, i.e., issuing free grants, the provinces would get no revenue. In the second instance, i.e., selling the lands, true they would derive a revenue from the sales, but at the same time, they would fatally restrain and check the growth of population. On the contrary, the continuation of the free grants system will, by increasing the population increase also the annual payments made by the Dominion government. The actual revenue which the Dominion government draws from the Northwest Territories is derived mainly from (a) homesteading fees and from (b) royalties on coal mines—but without worrying the House with figures, we may take it as granted that this revenue is quite insignificant compared to the cost of surveying, settling and administering the lands. I say, Sir, that if these lands were in the future offered for sale, instead of being free, the Dominion government would hardly be justified in maintaining as it does, a costly scheme of immigration at the general expense of the country, which would chiefly benefit the land speculators of the Northwest Territories.

I claim, Sir, that the new provinces have received a generous, a liberal treatment at the hands of their government. The financial clauses of the Bill bear evidence of our generosity. What do they receive besides their autonomy? Each province at the very start-off will have in addition to the usual federal subventions, an income in lieu of its lands of \$375,000. This amount will grow with the growth of population to \$562,500 when either of the provinces has 400,000 souls; to \$750,000 when it has 1,200,000 souls, and when it exceeds that number, the payment will reach \$1,125,000 yearly. In addition, interest will be paid on swamp lands valued at \$4,250,000 which will increase eventually to a capital amount of \$7,500,000.

Moreover, the Dominion will—and this fact should not be overlooked—still maintain our corps of mounted police in the Northwest Territories—a maintenance which entails an annual cost of \$300,000. Sir, I will not begrudge the Northwest Territories the happy circumstances under which they assume their political autonomy. This is not the time—and it is not in my nature to be envious. The prosperity, the happiness of my neighbour rejoices me; it never saddens me. But may I not pause for a moment and remind the House that the older provinces might well envy the fortune of Alberta and Saskatchewan? They, of

their own volition, acquired the great lone land in 1870; they—patriotically—pledged their credit for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; they unreservedly launched themselves into a vast scheme of colonization in order to settle the prairies. Yet to-day, after thirty-five years of sacrifices, saddled with their own obligations, cheerfully assess themselves again, to endow generously their two younger associates, in order to complete the gigantic work of confederation.

Again I say that I do not begrudge the Northwest Territories their good fortune. The ideal which we, as Canadians, pursue in this North American continent is too noble, too exalted, not to call for some sacrifices. The game is well worthy of the stake; the aspirations of Canada call forth our common efforts; the task of to-day is not unbecoming the attainments of to-morrow. In the language of the poet:

In the race, not in the prize,
Glory's true distinction lies.

I have now reached, Sir, the educational clauses of the Bill—which, in the present instances, might well be termed the crucial clauses if one can judge by the storm—nay, by the tornado they have raised in the Dominion. Political agitation is always fraught with danger even in a country where one race alone is dominant, but, Sir, far more dangerous is a religious agitation in a country like Canada, where two races and two creeds are staring at each other. Experience has taught us how easy it is to inflame religious passions and how difficult to quell them. Yet, it seems as if this sad experiment was to be renewed periodically in this fair land of ours. As a Canadian, I deplore the intolerant spirit which of late has pervaded spheres, where one would expect Christian charity, broad-mindedness, fair-play, to inhabit. After the bitterness displayed from one end of the country to the other on this school question, after the abuse heaped upon one particular class of His Majesty's loyal subjects, I fear not to say, Sir, that unless reason and wise counsels prevail, the future of this confederation is doomed and the cause of union buried for ever. Well might we apply to the present situation the prophetic word of Thiers when the 2nd empire was on the eve of crumbling to pieces: *Il n'y a plus qu'une seule faute à commettre.....*

I fail to understand, Sir, why the educational clauses have roused such anger amongst men who, by their calling in life, should be specially guarded against any display of temper. I quite agree with you that there are firebrands who delight in seeing the country ablaze, but I am not referring to the professional demagogues. I am addressing myself to that honest yet credulous class of people, whose sleep is haunted by nightmares, and who—once led astray—