

with his own pen, sent the following communication to his paper:

He explained the effect of the Manitoba Supreme Court judgment given in March last upon the Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption cases, which left all Canadian Pacific Railway lands and property in the Northwest Territories liable to school taxation as long as the area was not a province—a right of taxation which would not exist to-day had a province or provinces been created. Until this judgment was confirmed or upset by the Privy Council, Mr. Scott failed to see how the Northwest could afford to accept autonomy.

Then again on November 12 in an editorial of the Regina 'Leader' I find the following extract:

If the cases were finally settled there would no longer be a reason for delay. Until the cases are finally determined, final settlement of the autonomy question will remain a matter of practical impossibility. But the people of the Northwest contend that the new provinces must not be handicapped with any such tax exemption provisions. We contend that when erecting the province parliament must negotiate with the company for abrogation of the rights to exemption guaranteed to it by its contract. Now does any sane person think that parliament is in as good a position to enter into negotiations now with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the abrogation of the exemption rights, as parliament will occupy after the test cases are finally settled if the Manitoba Supreme Court's judgment be upheld by the Privy Council.

The hon. gentleman was very staunch in the month of November, 1903, in his opposition to autonomy being granted to the provinces at all until this Canadian Pacific Railway tax exemption case was entirely out of the way and settled by a decision of the Privy Council. To-day he is supporting this Bill, and that question still remains unsettled. The hon. gentleman also took strong grounds in days gone by in favour of one province. He spoke strongly in favour of one province, he has written strongly in favour of one province, and to-day he is voting in favour of two provinces. For he states on page 3751:

I may be permitted to say that I was myself quite strongly in favour of the proposition that only one province should be created; and even yet, looking at the question purely from the local and territorial point of view, I can see no reason why one government, one legislature, one set of machinery, should not have been sufficient for that territory.

Still he is voting for a Bill that provides for two provinces. He also took exception to the boundaries; he claimed that the present eastern boundary of the district of Alberta should have been the dividing line. That is not the dividing line under this Bill, but he is supporting the Bill with all the enthusiasm at his disposal. And, Mr. Speaker, while he is doing this he is calling the premier of the Territories, Mr. Haultain, a rabid partisan because he advocates the

very same things, and because he has been consistent enough to maintain his position. The hon. member for West Assiniboia also took strong ground in the past in favour of having the land retained by the provinces or handed over to the provinces; he took that ground in the year 1901, as quoted in 'Hansard' in the following words:

If the proper principle is adhered to, if the principle of absolute equality is observed, if parliament places the new provinces upon an equitable basis of local government, giving a proper grant for the government, also a per capita subsidy, and what may be shown to be due as a debt allowance, they will be put in possession of the public resources, lands, timber and minerals in the same way as the other provinces were put in possession of these resources.

Here was a strong expression of that hon. gentleman in favour of having all the lands handed over to the provinces. And what does he give as a reason for changing his opinion in this regard? He says that owing to his youth and inexperience he gave voice to opinion which was looked at in 1905 as an inaccuracy, that, as a matter of fact these other provinces were not put in possession, but they merely retained possession of their own lands. Then, he says:

These other provinces are not put in possession, but left in possession of these resources. Very young members sometimes fall into inaccuracies.

The hon. gentleman evidently has not got over his youth or he would not play the part of a weathercock politician being wafted hither and thither by every speech that is made in this House. We want a strong man at the head of the Department of the Interior. We do not want a man who is changing his opinions every day. The hon. gentleman states that he has changed his opinion on this question and he gives as his reason that he was influenced by the speeches made by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). Now, he has been speaking on public platforms in the past, he has been associated with his fellow westerners and he knew what their opinions were on this question. He has conversed with them in private and in public, but it only remains after these Bills are introduced and after he has listened to a couple of speeches in this House that were probably repeated to him in private on many occasions for the hon. gentleman to change his opinion. Under these auspices he gave utterance to the following statement in this parliament:

But I may say, that in 1901, when I made that statement, and even later, the principle found no general acceptance in this House or amongst any of the people east of the great lakes; and my main purpose in uttering these words here was to try and impress upon the people of