

friend is learning from the Minister of the Interior when he speaks of hon. gentlemen on this side not wanting those people to have representation, because they are poor half-breeds. No person on this side of the House has said anything of the kind. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are eager that every person in the Northwest whether half-breeds or not, should have representation; but what they do find fault with is that the representation is not properly mapped out, that the electors there who believe as the members of the opposition believe will be gagged or throttled. That is the reason we are finding fault with the legislation introduced by the government. Then my hon. friend from one of the eastern provinces is so eager that there should be two governments out there and that the cost of government in this country should be increased, that he thinks it is a matter of very little importance to create two provinces instead of one, and he finds fault with the opposition because they complain of this unnecessary addition to the cost of governing the country. The premier of the Northwest Territories also says it is unnecessary to establish two governments for a territory which has been governed by one legislature for the last twenty-five years or so.

These are some of the trifling things with which the opposition have been taking up the time of the House. I can hardly believe that the views entertained by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) are those entertained by the people of New Brunswick, because I cannot believe that the people of New Brunswick are any more in favour of costly government in the Territories than are the people of the other older provinces. If the hon. member claims that the people of New Brunswick are more extravagant in their administration than those of Nova Scotia, I am very sorry to hear it, but I did believe that our New Brunswick friends were in favour of good, honest and economical government, and that it would meet their views better to have the Territories administered by one government than by two. My hon. friend wanted to know what all the trouble was about, and he has characterized the different things we have discussed on this side as things of a trifling character. Was he trying his hand at obstruction, such as he claims we are indulging in on this side. Evidently that was his object or he would have treated these matters as of very serious importance. So far, as I am concerned, I believe that the boundary line is a serious question for the people of the Northwest. We have my hon. friend from Alberta, who has had some thirty years' experience in that country in ranching and managing cattle, and who has given expression to his views in a very practical manner, declaring that it is of vital importance to the people of the Northwest that the boundary line

Mr. INGRAM.

should be moved some sixty miles in order that this grievance of 15,000 brands may be removed. Would the right hon. gentleman explain what was his object in having this line placed where it is? The explanation he gave when he introduced the Bill was not very elaborate or precise. Would I be far astray if I were to state that it was political reasons which moved him and that his object was eventually to have two governments in the Northwest controlled by the Liberal party? Again would I be far astray if I were to say that the Liberal party in this House have gone back on some of the principles they advocated only a very few years ago? One of their principles was that in a matter of this kind, a commission of judges should be appointed for the mapping out of constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order. This is not in question. We are not discussing the number of constituencies, but the boundary line.

Mr. INGRAM. I am giving the reason why this boundary line is placed sixty miles from where it ought to be; and I say that the Liberal party formerly advocated the appointment of a commission of judges whose duty it would be to map out the schedule to a Bill of this nature.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well what the rule is. You must speak to a matter relevant to the clause under discussion, and that clause is one which concerns the limits of these provinces.

Mr. INGRAM. You are right, Sir, in your decision as to the rule.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is quite in order, if, for the purpose of showing that the boundary should be moved further eastwards or westwards, he questions the reasons that the government have given for placing it where it is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend think that to discuss the method of forming the constituencies, whether that should be done by judges or not, is relevant?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not what he was dealing with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He was pointing out the extraordinary division of the Territories, within these areas, into electoral divisions, and assigning that as a reason why the boundary line is placed where it is.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He was suggesting that the government should have the division made by judges and that was not relevant to the question.