

Mr. INGRAM. That is where we differ ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Deputy Speaker has given his decision.

Mr. INGRAM. Am I not within my rights in stating that this legislation was introduced as part of a political arrangement, and in adding that if the government had carried out their policy of years ago, namely, that matters of this kind should be left to a commission of judges, then instead of having a party political piece of legislation, there would be no necessity for putting this line where it is ? That is the comparison I made in discussing section 1, and in that I am quite within my rights. All these questions being involved in this section No. 1, it is a very serious thing to the people of the Territories and to the members of this House representing the Conservative party in the Northwest, where these two provincial governments will be, and it is a serious matter to men like my hon. friend from Alberta, who are vitally interested in the matter of raising stock and ranching. Then it is of vital consequence to people who have these 15,000 brands to deal with. I would like to know how are the two governments going to arrange their branding laws so that they will be satisfactory to both provinces. Will there not be a great deal of difficulty in that matter under those circumstances ? Is it not true that the cattle interest, to which the question of branding is so important will be but a minor industry in the province of Saskatchewan, and will there not be difficulty, therefore, in these people getting laws they wish and ought to have. So, our action is of very great importance to the people of the Northwest, and we should give it the most serious consideration ?

Let me call attention also to the fact that ministers of the Crown seem to act as though we on this side had no rights here, even going so far as to misrepresent statements made by members on this side. Under these circumstances, what does the Prime Minister expect ? Does he expect that this legislation will slip all the more easily for that reason ? I think he will have to undertake a lecture to his new minister, his baby colleague. That hon. gentleman talks like an old timer, like one who had been a cabinet minister for many years and has an established record. I think he will have to pursue a different course before he establishes a favourable reputation in this House.

Mr. LAKE. I am afraid I shall be unable to support the amendment proposed by the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I have never wavered in my belief that one province is sufficient, with the Territories before us, and therefore I could not vote in favour of a resolution which would make two small provinces out of the present organized Territories. The view I

hold on the question of two provinces, I believe, is the one held by the great majority of the people in that country. That is certainly the view that has been put on record by the majority of the members of the legislative assembly, and it was endorsed by the majority of the people when laid before them at the general elections for that assembly. I have always advocated one province, and still continue to do so. Believing in having only one province even if that province were treated as the older provinces of Canada have been and given possession of its public lands, I feel that I must all the more advocate it, when I find that we are to be deprived of that privilege. And while I am referring to this question perhaps I may be pardoned if I read a sentence or two from a letter I received this evening, it is written by a prominent gentleman in the Northwest Territories, a Liberal of high standing. He says :

I regret to see all the attention given to the school clauses to the exclusion of important features of the measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAKE. That is a regret which I certainly share with the writer of this letter. And I have not failed to voice my regret that it is a great pity that such clauses as the educational clauses should have been introduced into this Bill and should have such an overwhelming effect in obscuring other great questions which are deserving of attention. The letter I was quoting goes on :

It seems to me that the land question is of vastly greater and far-reaching importance than the school clauses. Over the one we have pretty absolute power, but over the lands we have no voice or power whatever. The principal reason that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Sifton urged for retaining the lands is, in my view, a strong reason why they should not.

And so on. These are the views of a leading Liberal in the Northwest.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I introduced that amendment to bring out a discussion of the question and I think we have had a considerable amount of light thrown upon it. I am altogether in favour of a single province rather than too small a province. I think a great mistake was made when Manitoba was established as a small province. And a greater mistake is made in not enlarging her boundaries now. Manitoba is entitled to larger boundaries. But we have been told recently why she is not given them. We have been told on the floor of this House that she has been punished because of her school legislation. We know that the maritime provinces would probably be better off with one strong provincial government than with the three they have today. And it is clear that if the provinces in the west have not their Crown lands, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, it will be