

(Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont), and I wish to emphasize what has already been said on this subject. Certainly if there is any advantage in having a seaport on Hudson bay, Saskatchewan is the province which has the greatest interest in this port, as it will be the natural highway for the export of her grain and cattle, and I do not think that there can be any doubt but that in the near future the province of Saskatchewan will be the greatest exporting province for grain in all Canada; and if the Hudson bay route ever becomes an actual route for export trade, the province of Saskatchewan will be the one most interested in its success and in the development of the port on the Churchill. Therefore, I say that the claim of Saskatchewan for a port on the Hudson bay should be well and fairly considered, and while we sympathize with the desire of Manitoba to increase her area, I do not think this sympathy should be allowed to override every other consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the terms of the Bill before us—and in considering this question, it seems to me that we should approach it in a calm and deliberative spirit, that we should not allow prejudice or feeling to warp our judgment as to the merits of the provisions contained therein—I may say that I approve of the division of the Territories into two provinces. The greatest disadvantage, it seems to me, of having one province for those western territories, would be that it would be unwieldy, and that a parliament of one hundred and fifty representatives would not properly represent the territory embraced in its boundaries, and one of the principal objects of having provincial governments would, as far as some parts of the Territories are concerned, be made null and void by the fact that it would practically be as far from exercising a supervision over those distant and almost inaccessible places as this government would. But another and a more powerful reason was the fear that if we had only one province the eastern part of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan would be thrown into Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, the idea of two provinces best suits the people of the Northwest, and I have not as yet heard any reasonable argument advanced why the fourth meridian, which is to divide this territory into two provinces, is not the best and fairest that could be made; for while Alberta spreads out at the north and has in this section a large amount of very valuable land, Saskatchewan on the contrary, has comparatively little good land north of the 53rd parallel; so that we have practically the same amount of arable land in each province. The only argument that has been advanced against it was that made by the hon. member for Calgary, who referred to the interests of the ranchers being affected prejudicially. Now, Mr. Speaker, ranching

has been carried on in all parts of the Territories. Even Yorkton has been known to ship out more cattle in one season than any other point in the Northwest, and we still have a great many cattle in that country; but owing to the advent of railroads the shipping of them is more distributed, and a number of stations do the work that was formerly done by one. I do not think this need give us any trouble, as stock associations will see that regulations are made which will conserve the interests of the ranchers; and as we are still of one nation, I do not imagine there will be any serious friction.

Now, in regard to our public lands. When I say our lands, I speak advisedly, as I think there are very few who will be unwilling to admit that we have at least a beneficiary right to these lands. To speak of the Dominion having bought them is not admissible. All that they bought were certain claims and mythical rights of the Hudson Bay Company, and Great Britain ceded her rights in this property to the Dominion to govern and enact laws for its well-being, and to hold in trust for the benefit of those who might in the future occupy and develop them. I do not agree with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he says that the Dominion bought and owns these lands. I claim that these lands, when viewed from any reasonable standpoint, are the property of the people residing in the Territories. But while I claim all this, I am a consistent supporter of this Bill; for in lieu of our land, it provides for us an ample revenue for our present needs and a reasonable increase up to and until our population reaches 1,200,000 when it amounts to \$2,207,875 and then becomes stationary, but is guaranteed to us for all time to come; and we have a guarantee that the lands will be administered as well as we could administer them, and for the benefit of the provinces and the whole of the Dominion. I think, however, there should be another clause added to this part of the Bill, limiting the time for which the lands should remain in the hands of the Dominion, and providing that at the expiration of a reasonable time any land remaining in the possession of the Crown should revert to the province in which such land is located.

I will now speak for a few moments on the educational question—not from a legal standpoint, except to make reference to one phase of it, which it seems to me would naturally suggest itself to the mind of any person who had read the clause referring to this subject in the British North America Act, and that is the clause thereof referring to the union of any province with the Dominion, which is as follows:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools, which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

Mr. CASH.