

the schools out there are non-sectarian and national. In this connection, I would also draw attention to the fact that the great mass of immigration to-day is from the United States, where there are no separate schools. Therefore, the argument that certain people have come out there by virtue of representations regarding a system of separate schools, is not borne out by facts. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated that he would be quite willing to accept the views of seven out of the ten representatives coming from the Territories. Let me congratulate him and the government on their change of front, because they have not always been ready to accept these views. If they had, we would like to know whether the seven gentlemen from the Northwest Territories are responsible for this legislation, because it is generally understood that they stood out against it until it was amended. But if there are seven gentlemen from the Territories who say that the people out there are satisfied with a separate school system and want that system to be continued and are in favour of having the right to establish any system they please taken from them, let me tell you that that has not always been the case, because the hon. members from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) voted in the local legislature up there to cut out everything in the Act of 1875 after the word 'education,' which would have the effect of handing that matter entirely over to the local legislature. I would also suggest that if the government desire to feel the pulse of the people on the question, let them open up a constituency there and appeal to the electors.

I see that the hour is getting late and I do not desire to trespass too much upon the time of this House, but there are certain matters which I feel bound to bring to its attention; and if I am transgressing the time allotted a new member, I shall only have to appeal to the indulgence of the House and point to the fact that there are none but new members on the Conservative side from the Northwest Territories. There are certain other important features in this Bill to which I wish to refer. There is first the placing of the boundary line at the fourth meridian. A few days ago I called attention to a resolution passed at a public meeting in the town of Medicine Hat which pointed out the objections to this line. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) let the cat out of the bag the other day when he said he was of the opinion that the dividing line should be sixty miles further east. Thus we see the disadvantage of not having in this cabinet a representative from the west. I was accused of having indulged in ill-natured criticism the other day when I said that the minister who was in charge of the Territories should have been consulted, but I certainly did not intend to make any ill-natured reflec-

tion, and shall continue to call the attention of the government at every opportunity to the injustice they are inflicting on the Territories in not filling the vacant portfolio. To-day we are in this position that there is not a man in the cabinet west of the city of London, Ont., except one, and that gentleman is only half in. And the result of having no man in the cabinet charged with the supervision of the task of dividing that country has been that local interests have been allowed to prevail. The boundaries have been fixed to suit particular localities without regard to the ranching industry or anything else. It will be found, on examining the map published by the Department of the Interior, that only a very small amount of the ranching country remains to-day in the eastern province, and the danger will be that the ranching industry, which is a very important one, will not be sufficiently represented in the local House to have its interests properly looked after. That industry in the eastern province will be a mere side issue. Take, for instance, the difficulties which will probably arise out of conflicting branding laws. That may seem a very small matter to the man in the east, but it is very important to the west. The other day it was pointed out, in the discussion of an Order in Council passed by the Department of Agriculture, that 411,000 cattle, were treated under that order in an area practically abutting this dividing line. The badge of ownership to-day in that country is the brand, and the result of drawing this line and so splitting up the ranching country will be a conflict of brands. One province may or may not enact a branding law. One province may declare that cattle and horses not branded may be sold irrespective of the owner, and you will have a conflict in that way, whereas if the line went a little bit further east, where the Minister of the Interior says it should go, that difficulty would not arise and you would include practically all the ranching country in the western province.

Again, one province may adopt a free open range, while the other may make restrictions. We have the same difficulty to-day on the international boundary, although there is the same grazing country on the boundary as we have at the dividing line of the two provinces, and although we have customs officers and the mounted police who assist in keeping matters in order. Yet difficulties have always arisen. Another difficulty we are creating is that you will leave such a very little portion of the irrigated land in the eastern province that it will be hardly worth while passing legislation respecting it. While that difficulty may be got over by the provisions of the Bill under which the matters are left with the federal administration. But, if I understood the ex-Minister of the Interior

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.