

the control of the Dominion of Canada, after we had railroads built through the country, and instead of increasing in value, if such a thing were possible they decreased in value. But they at last began to increase. We on this side of the House say it was because of the policy of the government, because of the administration of the Minister of the Interior; they may give any other reason they like, but the fact was that the land did not increase in value until settlers came in to settle upon it. When they hold that the land was a value in itself, I say they are mistaking the point altogether. The land only has a value in so far as it is in demand by settlers. When my hon. friend made his careful calculation as to setting apart certain tracts of land, and the Dominion government advancing money on the security of that land, he based the success of his project on the idea that the country would continue to prosper, that settlement would continue to increase, that the price of land would continue to rise. Now that supposition is all based on the success of the administration in securing progressive settlement upon the land, and if circumstances arise in which that increase of value does not continue, then his whole calculation falls to the ground. The first thing is to have such a policy and such an administration as will bring settlers into the country, as will give value to the land, as will give revenue to the Dominion, and will do all those desirable things that my hon. friend depicted as occurring if the land were in the hands of the provincial authorities. The thing is to get the settler, and the question of who administers the land is a small consideration. It is a small matter whether it is the Dominion or the province, but we say that the Dominion is in a better position to administer the lands satisfactorily and well than is the province. My hon. friend spoke of the time when these provinces would have a population of millions, and he declared that when that time came they would have their faces set towards Ottawa, and come here demanding increased subsidies. Otherwise they would have to resort to direct taxation, or else they would not have the funds with which to carry on the provincial government. There is a possibility such as he has spoken of. But when a few minutes after, he suggested that I was under a mistake in saying that the increase of settlement would increase the burdens of the provincial government, and went on to point out that the settler who goes into the province is a benefit to the provincial government and not a burden, that he is not a source of expenditure to the provincial government, I ask him respectfully, how he reconciles his two arguments. If so large a population is going to put the provincial government behind financially, then certainly my statement is borne out that the increase of settlement does increase the burden of provincial govern-

Mr. OLIVER.

ment. As my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has pointed out, every communication that has come from the Northwest government to this Dominion asking for an increased subsidy from year to year has pointed out, and properly so, that the increase became necessary on account of increased settlement.

Now, I want to say a word in regard to the objections that have been persisted in by some of our hon. friends on the other side to the inclusion of the district of Athabaska in these two new provinces. Do these gentlemen not know that the province of Manitoba, this pet province of theirs, is, as we are told by the papers, on the verge of rebellion? The government is about to resign and demand a dissolution, because that province has not had the territory to its north included within its boundaries; and the reason that it makes these demands, the reason for the excitement in that province, is because these provinces of the west have been given the increase of territory that the province of Manitoba desires, and which every authority of our friends on the opposite side in that province declares it is entitled to and should have and cannot get along without. If the government of Manitoba is honest and sincere in its declaration that the province of Manitoba is entitled to an addition to its northern boundary—and who is there to say it is not—surely these two provinces are equally entitled to the inclusion of this territory of Athabaska. I shall not go over what has been gone over so often as to the certainties of development of that part of the district of Athabaska, which will form part of the province of Alberta. There is no reason from any point of view why that country should not be included in the new province. There is every reason, from every point of view, why it should be included in the new province.

As to the causes of offence which the other provinces have against the Dominion for the terms that have been made with these new provinces, I will take the liberty of thinking at any rate that our hon. friends who argue so eloquently, who have argued so eloquently and forcefully, for the control by these new provinces of their lands for the sake of revenue from those lands, are rather anxious to save the Dominion treasury from the payment of the subsidy which this agreement gives those provinces than to give the provinces control of their lands. I think that if the matter is discussed to a finish that will be found to be the principal trouble. As far as we in the west are concerned, we know perfectly well, we are practical people, and we know that we cannot eat our cake and have it, we know that we cannot sell our lands and give them away, and we believe that so long as the government of the Dominion pursues the policy of using the lands for purposes of settlement rather than for purposes of revenue, it is a very much better arrange-