

carry out our immigration policy. So far as the money is concerned, there can be no objection to the grant. So recently has it been pointed out in this House that we are entitled to more money than we get, that it is not necessary for me to go over the argument and point out that 91,000 people—which I think is more correct than even 84,000 people—but that 84,000 to 91,000 people in the North-west Territories are entitled to a great deal more money than we are getting, and that something like a million and a quarter dollars is due to us on arrears, if we get our deserts. Therefore, I do not think that the most economical member on either side of the House will have the least objection to the proposal I make. I may say that there will be a good deal of disappointment, at all events in my constituency, if the hon. Finance Minister does not place a sum in the Estimates, as I suggest, and for this reason. We did not anticipate a change of Government. I told my constituents everywhere that it was the intention of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to place \$20,000 for this purpose in the Supplementary Estimates, and that that would have been placed there had the late Government been enabled to proceed with its Estimates, and I of course argued with my constituents, the electorate of Assiniboia, that they should support a Conservative Government which, in so many ways, and this among the rest, had inaugurated policies for the advantage of the North-west Territories. I hope, Sir, that there will be no objection to passing this motion. I may say that I divided the House on it a couple of sessions ago, and on that occasion I had the support of the hon. First Minister (Mr. Laurier), and I think the great bulk of his party, and I think there can be no objection to it now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad to support any proposition made to aid in any way the industries of the North-west Territories. Such a proposition is certainly entitled to the support of every member representing those Territories, but I do not see any reason why any particular sum should have been mentioned in this motion. I fail to see by what calculation the hon. gentleman arrives at the conclusion that \$20,000 is the exact amount that should be taken out of the immigration grant for the purpose of aiding creameries.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not propose that this shall be taken out of the immigration fund, but that it be considered as part of the immigration grant and added to whatever the immigration grant is.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly satisfied to consider it as part of the immigration or as an addition to that grant, for it does seem to me that the immigration grant we have received in the past, judging by its results, has not been altogether a very valuable

grant. It seems to me, therefore, there is no necessity for limiting the amount to \$20,000. It might have been \$30,000 or \$40,000, and in fact it seems to me entirely unnecessary that a sum should be mentioned at all. It would have been quite sufficient for the hon. gentleman to say that he desired the Government of the day to assist creameries in the Territories. That proposition I would have been glad to support, but the hon. gentleman has seen fit to attach to his motion a certain proposition in which I cannot agree. His motion reads:

For the purpose of establishing creameries and cheese factories in the North-west.

That is to say, that the Government of this country is to go into competition with industries already established in those Territories. Now, I certainly cannot agree with any proposition such as that. In the district which I represent there are in operation now four creameries, which represent a very considerable investment of capital by private individuals. I would certainly object to a proposition that would bring the Government into active competition with private capital in this business. It seems to me that that is not the way in which we can arrive at the best development of the creamery industry of the North-west Territories. Nor can I agree with the details of the scheme as presented by the hon. gentleman, as it seems to me that his proposition is one that is not based upon the facts of the case. The drawback to the creamery industry of the North-west is not the lack of capital to build creameries or to run them. The trouble, as any practical man knows, lies in the scattered nature of the settlement and the lack of cows, or the lack on the part of the settlers of capital that would enable them to purchase cows. This proposition to build up the creamery industry by building creameries begins at the wrong end of the business; it is not more creamery establishments that we want, but more settlers and more cows. If we had the country more closely settled and the people in possession of an adequate number of cows, the creamery industry would follow as a matter of course. That is what is wanted, and to spend Government money in building creameries would simply be to waste that money and would not benefit and advantage the creamery industry as it should be and as I hope the Government will see its way clear to benefit and advantage it. In one part of the country in which I live there are a large number of poor settlers, brought in through the active immigration policy of the Government. These people have come in, in many cases with empty hands. You may build them all the creameries you like, but unless you can increase the number of cows available to supply the creameries, you had better save your money. Much as I wish to see the creamery industry developed, and much as I wish to see