

not well informed, and that after looking into the thing they are prepared to accept a compromise. If that be their view, it is not the view of the people of the west; and when they go back to the people and try to explain the compromise they have agreed to on all these questions, they will be taught the lesson they richly deserve. Everything, they now say, can be settled in a spirit of compromise, and they are here to make the best possible compromise. It was not for that purpose they were elected. They are prepared to do anything however to save their party. That is their sole object. But it seems to me that their object ought rather to be to vindicate their principles. Every effort they make, however, is to keep the Liberal party, by some means or other, in office, accept the dictates of the Liberal chieftain, and compromise those principles which they used to advocate so strongly, to which they pledged themselves on every platform in the west, and which the people of the west hold so dearly. They made a pretense of independence, but what did it amount to? The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) bolted and out went these hon. gentlemen from the west behind him. They then held a little caucus and said: We must have a change in the School Act. Then the ex-Minister of the Interior got up and said he would support what he considered to be a substantial change.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am only giving this as an illustration to show how cheaply these hon. gentlemen hold their principles. We have never yet been told on what compromise they came back to the fold and what is the difference between the original clause and the present one. Yet the compromise has been accepted; and they have swallowed their medicine, and they are now striving to look pleasant over it. That is not a wholesome spectacle to show this country. Heaven only knows what other things they will be prepared to sacrifice before this debate is through. I believe that the people of the west want to control their own educational affairs and their own land, and I believe they are quite competent to control and administer both. Hon. gentlemen opposite are on record as having taken that view in the old days, but it is not their view to-day; and I trust that the members from the west will give this country a better reason for their submission than any they have so far given. I trust they will be able to give a better reason for consenting to have the new provinces deprived of their right to administer their own lands than that they do not see any income from these lands. There is an income to be derived from them, and it would be an easy matter for the provinces to base a system on which they could raise an income from those lands. Look at our

friends, the railway contractors. All they need do to finance these days is to pawn these lands. Men like Mann and Mackenzie can go to the Dominion government and get their notes endorsed for \$9,000,000 on the strength of their land grant. They go to the province of Ontario and their note is endorsed for \$1,000,000. They can go to Nova Scotia and raise money in the same way. They can go to Manitoba, where there is a Conservative government in power, and their note, with these lands as security, is endorsed for \$1,000,000. If these railway promoters can have their notes endorsed and financed in this way, surely these great provinces about to be erected in the west could evolve a financial policy based on their lands which would give them ready money, and they would then enjoy the income that would naturally come from those lands. Speaking from a Dominion point of view and as a citizen of Ontario, I could justify the policy of the Dominion holding on to these lands; but how a member from the Northwest can advocate any such policy I am at a loss to understand. This is but another instance of the abandonment of provincial interests and provincial rights in the interests of some outside concerns.

Mr. SCOTT. It is perfectly true that the opinion of a good many people in the Northwest Territories has been undergoing a change with regard to this question of lands. I do not know that my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) can be entirely relieved of responsibility for that fact. He made a statement on this question a little more than a year ago. Let me quote a part of that statement, which, perhaps he has forgotten:

The question of the autonomy of the Northwest has been brought up. I stand in favour of government by the people. The people of the Northwest are ready to assume the responsibility of their own government, they are ready to do it as we in Ontario are determined to maintain the system we have here. Why cannot the people of the Northwest be given a government of their own? They are prosperous, they have schools and other things to carry on, and they can manage for themselves as well as this government can do it for them. Why cannot the Northwest Territories be erected into a province? The people are asking for relief and they cannot get it, but if the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific want anything, you find the great Liberal party turning hand-springs to give them everything they want. There is no legislature in this country to-day doing anything for the people, but every one of them is turning hand-springs to distribute the resources of the country among the great corporations.

What did that mean? It could only mean that my hon. friend wanted other legislatures established,—new legislatures created in the Northwest,—and the public resources put into their hands, so that those legislatures could, as he says, turn handsprings to give these public resources to corporations. Was that not reason enough to lead