

did not intend to give to the Territories that full measure of control, which is intrusted to the people of the older provinces, it is the language of the Minister of the Interior last year in the debate on the Transcontinental Bill. What he said then was that this measure would not be of any cost to the people of Canada, because the sale of certain lands in the Northwest Territories which were not reserved for settlers would more than pay the total cost. In order that I may not do my hon. friend any injustice, let me quote his language, which is reported at page 8680 :

What I desire to say is this : There is probably, out of that 50,000,000 of acres of odd-numbered section—the even-numbered sections are kept for the poor man's homestead—20,000,000 or 25,000,000 at the present so far removed from communication as to be absolutely of no money value whatever. But in my judgment, within ten years from the time this railway is completed, 20,000,000 acres of land owned by the government at present will have acquired a value at least of \$3 per acre. That is not a thing about which there is any question. We have seen it happen before, and we know it will happen again. I have quoted this to the House to show that, so far from the railway costing the people anything, the fact will be that the enhanced money value of the property of the government will be four times as great as will be necessary to pay for the road.

And in connection with the same matter he pointed out that he was about to bring in a measure providing for the sale of these lands. Therefore he clearly contemplates the policy of depriving the people of the Northwest Territories for all time to come of that control of their public lands, mines and minerals which is enjoyed by the people of every other province.

There is another matter to which I think we might have had some reference in the speech from the Throne ; and we are entitled to at least some expression of intention with regard to it from my right hon. friend when he comes to address the House. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last year introduced a Bill for the purpose of amending the election law, and after some debate upon the measure, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) took it up, and spoke very forcibly and very wisely with regard to it. He referred to the evils which had manifested themselves throughout the country in connection with election matters, and appealed to hon. members on both sides of the House to earnestly take up the question and devise a measure which would put an end as far as possible to those scandals which have for years disgraced the proceedings of our election courts. My hon. friend said :

We must recognize, from the revelations of the election courts, that there have been manifestations in connection with elections which must be a cause of regret to men on both sides ; and if we approach the subject dispassionately, with a desire to bring about some improvement, I think something might be done.

Among other things my hon. friend spoke of the evil of trading off, as he termed it, election petitions. His language on that point is so forcible that I think it worthy of quotation :

With regard to the trading off of election petitions, it does seem a public scandal ; but on the other hand one-half of the petitions are filed without any knowledge or information, and there is no great harm in withdrawing them. But with a proper administration of our election laws, we might save a great deal of scandal and trouble that now exists. We should make an attempt in a non-partisan spirit, and if our hon. friends opposite will receive the suggestion in that spirit, we would be glad to meet them in a committee and undertake to bring about a reform in the law, not simply to the extent to which the hon. member for North Norfolk desires, but beyond that in other directions that may make for purity in elections.

I supported my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the endeavour, but I regret to observe that there is no mention of it in the speech from the Throne, and up to the present time we have had no expression of any intention on the part of the government to deal with this very important subject.

There is another matter to which no reference is made in the speech from the Throne, though it was the subject of a good deal of jubilation on the part of my hon. friends in days gone by. I do not know whether it has become so old that my right-hon. friend has forgotten it ; but there was a time when we on this side of the House were taunted that this government, in the wisdom of their statesmanship, had solved the fast Atlantic service question in a way which should put us to the very blush. My right hon. friend was not so silent on this subject in days gone by, when the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other members of the government taunted us on this side of the House with what had been accomplished by the government. And now the subject is deemed of such little importance that it is not even mentioned in the speech from the Throne. Last year the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) congratulated himself and the government and the country that not one single step had been taken in the direction of a fast Atlantic steamship service. What was the tone of my right hon. friend a few years ago ? Does he remember the day when he produced before a Toronto audience that famous telegram from the Minister of Finance ? Does he remember what he said on that occasion ?

To-day I have a telegram from my friend and colleague, Mr. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, to this effect : ' Peterson has made to-day the deposit required by the contract.'

We have it announced in the speech from the Throne to-day that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company have made the deposit required by their contract. Well, I trust that more may be accomplished by the present deposit