they will come to the conclusion that there has been a fair arrangement both for the provinces and the Dominion government. Our revenue will be at least equal to that of the other provinces in the Dominion, and I think it is fair to all parties.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess that the figures given by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) rather surprise me. In the statement brought down by the government giving the quantity of land vested in the Crown in these proposed provinces I find the following :

Lands vested in the Crown in the proposed provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively :
Alberta, 129,556,903 ; Saskatchewan, 120,880,366.

These are certainly very far in excess of the figures mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Your estimate is 250,000,000, and I was estimating the whole at 300,000,000. The hon. member for North York estimated that there are 228,000,000 of agricultural land. I put it at 200,000,000 and I think I am more nearly correct. I claim that not more than two-thirds of the entire area is land fit for agricultural purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The figures I gave are the number of acres of land still vested in the Crown, not what is contained within the area of the two provinces. I am not dealing with that. I am aware that a considerable portion has been disposed of in a variety of ways, such as subsidizing railways, homesteads and so forth. That leaves us still nearly 250,000,000 acres in the two provinces. That is very far in excess of the amount given by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. P. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman will surely not say that there are 250,000,000 acres of agricultural or arable land.

Mr. HENDERSON. The statement is of lands vested in the Crown.

Mr. P. TALBOT. That portion of eastern part of Athabaska is of the same formation as the Rainy River, which is not arable land.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly not ; but, of course, we have no information at hand to-night on that point.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Any good map will give a person an idea of what are agricultural lands, and that is how I reach my conclusion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not intend to detain the committee for more than a short time. I confess that I have been more than surprised to hear the statements of hon. members from this Northwest country. I confess that I had the opinion that the people of the Northwest wanted complete autonomy, wanted the full right of self-government including the right to administer their lands. As it was very forcibly put by Mr. Haultain in a letter addressed to the Minister of the Interior on the 31st of January, 1903 :

What the people wanted there was equal rights with all the other provinces of the Dominion and the same financial consideration that has been given to those provinces. Control of public domain in the west by the west and for the west.

Now, I am sorry to say there has not been a single member on the other side of this House coming from the west who has shown himself willing, during this debate, to stand up in defence of these provinces and to advocate the rights of the people of the west in the west. What their motive is I cannot possibly conceive. I have always understood that what the people of the west wanted was complete autonomy. In the petitions laid before this House during the present session with reference to the Bill before us, wherever reference was made to the land, in every instance, I believe I am right in saying the prayer of that petition was that the people of the west should have the right to govern their lands. I do not recall a single instance where the people petitioned that the Dominion government should administer the lands belonging to the Crown in that country.

Now, I do not believe that the people of the west will be satisfied with this kind of legislation. I believe we are simply creating a grievance that will have to be removed some day, otherwise there will be dissatisfaction in that country for many years to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be perfectly sincere, but I cannot for the life of me believe that members from the west supporting the government reflect to-day the feeling of that country. But then they tell us : See the verdict in Edmonton. Have we had a verdict from Edmonton with respect to the land question or the school question ? I say we have not. Edmonton is a very large district and I apprehend that a large proportion of the people, probably one-half or three-quarters did not know that there was an election going on. The statement that they expressed an opinion is absolutely absurd. They had no opportunity to vote, nor do I believe they had the opportunity of knowing that the question was being submitted to them who their representative should be. When these hon. gentlemen say : Look at the verdict from Edmonton ; I say : Look at the verdict from Western Assiniboia. If I mistake not, Western Assiniboia was asked to pronounce a verdict on this question before Edmonton was. And their answer was : Stay away, don't come here, for the verdict will be against you. That is a section of the country where the people could be con-