

for precedents, particularly on fiscal matters—to the United States. To quote:

From the highest grounds of policy, I think it is advisable that the ownership of these lands should continue to be vested in the Dominion Government. We have precedents for this. This is a case in which we can go to the United States for precedents. They are situated very much as we are regarding the ownership of lands and the establishment of new states. Whenever a new state had been created in the American Union, the federal Government has always retained the ownership and management of the public lands.

Therefore he thought it was only right and proper that we should do so in this country, and he bolstered up his attitude by quoting the policy adopted by the United States federal Government. The right hon. gentleman says that he stands by that policy to-day; so the people of the West know just what to expect from him when we have a change of government.

Some of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues from the West also spoke on this question. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) said:

I, for one, am perfectly satisfied with the arrangement made, I think it is a better arrangement than to have handed over the lands to the provinces.

Mr. Talbot, now a senator, referring to the lands, said:

These residents of the proposed provinces, who look on this question from a sentimental point of view only, will no doubt favour provincial ownership, but I am convinced that the practical men, who consider the future prosperity of not only the new provinces but of the Dominion as a whole, will be perfectly satisfied to have the land administered by the federal Government.

The former Postmaster General, now member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), said:

I claim that this domain is the property of the whole Dominion of Canada, and it would be 'unwise and inopportune' to part with it.

That is the position taken by those gentlemen at that time and I have not heard that they have since changed their position. Another gentleman, Mr. Crawford, formerly a member from Manitoba stated:

I think it would be a great mistake for this Parliament to leave the control of the lands entirely in the hands of the provinces. As I have said, so far as Manitoba is concerned there never would have been any question of provincial rights if the same liberal terms had been given Manitoba which are now being extended to the territories.

The province of Manitoba had its boundaries extended two years ago, and the hon. leader of the Opposition asks why we did

[Mr. Roche.]

not restore the natural resources to Manitoba at that time. Hon. gentlemen will remember that it was at the first session of this Parliament. It had been promised by this Government and had been denied by the previous Government for many years. Manitoba had been pleading for terms of equality. She asked either for the restoration of the public domain, or to be placed on the same plane and given the same financial considerations as the two other western provinces. They got the same financial terms at the first session of this Parliament.

The Premier of Saskatchewan, for several years before the Autonomy Bill came in, had said that he was in favour of the natural resources being restored to Alberta and Saskatchewan, but when the Bill actually came in he reversed his position and supported the Autonomy Bill. He attributed his conversion to the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). That hon. gentleman has stated his opinion as follows:

One hon. gentleman said that the lands could be better administered by the province than by the Dominion because the people of the province were closer to the ground, and the interests of the province he said were just the same as the interests of the Dominion. I beg to differ, their interests are not the same. The interest of a province in the land is in the revenue it can derive from the sale of the lands; the interest of the Dominion in the lands is in the revenue it can derive from the settler who makes that land productive.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) also said the financial terms were fair and reasonable.

I have quoted these gentlemen to show the inconsistent attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have certainly condemned this Government for not having restored the natural resources up to the present time. The Prime Minister made his position very clear. Rome was not built in a day and the leader of the Opposition is certainly the last man in Canada who should reflect on any person, or on any head of a government, for not having implemented his pledge. I might recall to his recollection the platform of 1893.

You can run it down plank by plank, and I defy him to show one single plank that he implemented in the interest of the people in the fifteen years that he occupied the treasury benches. Still, because my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, at the third session since he has been returned to power, has not thus far restored the natural resources to these provinces, the right hon. leader of the Opposition