

THE PROPOSAL QUESTION.

H. H. Bennett asked as follows: In the issue of the Moose Jaw Times of Friday, March 15, 1901, there appears a report of a speech delivered on March 12, 1901, by hon. J. H. Ross, late commissioner of public works for the Territories. The report among other things contains the following:

"In his opinion, and he had good reason for his opinion, not one foot of the North-West Territories would ever be added to Manitoba. He knew not only the Government, but the Parliament of Canada, the supreme power in this matter, were seized of the fact that the best interests of the Territories would be served by one province. There was a time, when, owing largely to the lack of facilities for transportation and communication it was necessary that there should be many provinces and many capitals, but that day was passed and there was not a shadow of a reason why the Territories should not become one strong united province."

1. Has the Government or any member of it any knowledge that the Government of Canada is seized of the fact that the interests of the Territories will be served by one province?

2. Did Mr. Ross furnish the Government or any member thereof, with any memoranda, correspondence or data indicating the views of the Federal Government, or any member thereof, upon the question of the erection of the Territories into a province or provinces?

3. Did Mr. Ross verbally intimate to the Government, or any member thereof, the opinion which had been expressed to him by the Federal Government, or any member thereof, as to the terms upon which the Territories or any part would be erected into a province into provinces or as to whether the Territories would be erected into one province or more?

Peterson Hamilton said the first question was somewhat ambiguous. If it meant that the Government of Canada as Government were "seized of the fact that the interests of the Territories will be served by one province," then he was not prepared to say if this was the case, but if it meant that some members of the Government were of that opinion, he thought the answer would be in the affirmative. The answer to question 2 was No. In regard to question 3 it touched upon a matter of private conversation and was not a proper subject for inquiry in the House.