

provinces to bear alone a portion of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway equal to the item of cost which the whole of Canada bears by its \$25,000,000 cash subsidy. I ask again, is there any fairness in that? Mr. Ross saw in 1881, if the exemptions were made an item of the contract, that when provinces were created it would be improper and unjust to leave them saddled with the burden of the exemptions. Mr. Blake in 1881 declared that the people of the Northwest would be less than men if they suffered such a limitation upon their autonomy to exist. In January, 1905, when confronted with the declaration of the government that provinces were to be erected this year, I took the position that if it was intended to leave the provinces under these exemptions I must oppose the measures, in particular view of the possibility that by waiting for the Privy Council judgment on the test cases a comparatively easy way might be found of obtaining relinquishment by the company of the provincial exemption rights. The Prime Minister intimated to me his recognition that these exemptions, both Dominion and provincial, would have to be abrogated in the interests not alone of the provinces but of the Dominion. With that intimation that the provinces need not fear that they would be left under the exemption perpetually I consented to take my part in discussing the autonomy terms and voted for the second reading of the Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. If you had not got that you would be on strike I presume.

Mr. SCOTT. You can have your own opinion about that. The Prime Minister has publicly repeated the assurance which he gave to me. What I ask now is that the government and the House shall concur in that assurance in a tangible way by putting in black and white in these provincial charters the notice of intention to cancel these exemptions,—a notice to all concerned, to the company, to the people of Canada and especially to the people of the new provinces. Is it unnecessary? I say it is no more unnecessary than your section 23. Section 23 does not say that the province cannot tax the Canadian Pacific Railway road or lands. It is not section 23 of these Bills, but section 16 of the contract of 1881 which imposes the limitation. Section 23 merely states that the provinces are subject to that contract—to the degree that the contract is good or bad in legality or constitutionality, weak or strong, doubtful or perfect, to that degree the provinces are bound. If you deem it proper and imperative to thus give notice to the provinces that their autonomy has been invaded by a previous parliament, then I say that it is not only equally proper, but doubly imperative, if there is sincerity behind the assurance given by the Prime Minister, which I do not for a moment question, that you shall give notice at the same time and in

the same manner that parliament will in good time remedy that invasion, and that the provinces will not be left for ever under the unfair burden of these exemptions.

I appeal to the Liberal party on the strength of the principle of provincial rights; on the statement I made here in 1901, that entire equality as between the provinces is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of confederation; on the sound doctrine preached in this Chamber 25 years ago by Blake, Cameron, Charlton, Mills, Paterson, Cartwright, Laurier, and other Liberal leaders; and particularly on the declaration made in 1881 by Hon. G. W. Ross, which I have read. I appeal to the Conservative party in this matter because the difficulty is of their creation. It is not these Bills, it is not section 23 which limits provincial autonomy, but section 16 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. Whatever substantial or serious lack of autonomy there is against which these provinces will have to complain, is not the deed of the Liberal party, but of the Conservative party. Let me tell my hon. friends opposite that they need not think so far as the people of the Northwest Territories are concerned, that by raising a school question dust or a land question dust they are going to hide from the people of these Territories the knowledge of the fact that it is the Conservative party, that is responsible for the only material limitation upon their autonomy which is being granted by these Bills to the new provinces. In every other respect where there is a departure from the strict plan of confederation it is a departure with which the people of the new provinces are entirely content. There is a departure with respect to representation; provision is made in these Bills for redistribution upon a census to be taken midway between two decennial censuses and there never has been any such provision made for any other province. That departure is in the interest of the people of these new provinces. There is a departure in connection with the debt or capital account. When I raised that question my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) took the position that it was much better in the interests of the people of these provinces that they should be put in a different position from the other provinces with regard to their capital or debt account. For instance, several million dollars stand to the credit of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it is in the power of the governments of these provinces to withdraw that capital and use it immediately in any way they choose. But by these Bills the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan are not going to be left at liberty to withdraw their capital; all they will be able to do is to take from year to year 5 per cent interest on the capital account.

Mr. SPROULE. Where does the hon. gentleman find authority for saying that