



Good health depends mostly upon the food we eat.

We can't be healthy if we take alum or other poison daily in our food.

When outfitting for camp always take Dr. Price's Cream Baking Powder for good health and good food. It makes the finest flapjacks, biscuits and bread.

PRICE BAKING POWDER CO.,
CHICAGO.

Never go into the woods away from a doctor with a cheap alum baking powder in the outfit. You want the best baking powder in the world—and it is most economical in the end.

ADDRESS ADOPTED

(Continued from page 1.)

should be an equal allowance to those in these districts. It is not fair to us to do so. The corporation should be entitled to that which is withheld from other provinces. During the time he has represented the electorate of North Qu'Appelle he has almost every year brought before them the lack of water in that district, specially north of the Qu'Appelle Valley. This Government has not yet successfully coped with that question, in fact they have made a complete failure of it. Had they been more like Government they would have done this, secured for these settlers a constant supply of water. They have even discouraged the people in that district as they have gone in and made unsuccessful attempts to get water.

I would refer also to the diatribe in last week's paper. There was a vote in 1900 in 1901 for roads that to this day are not done. If the hon. gentleman would call that a business-like government he has a poor idea of what it is.

I would call attention to the excessive selling lands or areas of taxes we have on the expensive mining system of Manitoba and the other provinces. There is to my mind much more expensive than the system of confiscating lands in the local improvement districts. My attention was called to one case where the arrears were \$5,000 and the land was redeemed within three or four months and the costs were \$14,00, making a total of \$19,00. I do not think the Commissioner of Public Works or any member of the Government can bring it to the attention of the House in any province where such an excessive sum is charged up. I had a case in Manitoba brought to my attention where the costs were not one-third, much proportionately as in this case.

We told him that there has been a great increase in the population and that we would have additional representation. I think as members of the Opposition we will see that as far as the Government are concerned they would not legislate us out of the House. If no, no, I only hope they will see that fairness which the settlers in this country demands. They should take into consideration what will happen in the next few years. There are some of us who cannot see that they will give all the people in the Territories that just what we think they should have. We are not but have they pressed enough? What the people require we have it now. (Cheers.)

BRIEFER REPLIES.

Hautain replied to Mr. McDonald. He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able once again to join with my hon. friend opposite on this occasion do so it is a matter of congratulating the hon. member who moved and seconded the Address in reply to the Speech.

Mr. McDonald: I only congratulated him.

Mr. Hautain: Then, on behalf of myself and the members of this House to the hon. member for the Address. It is the first time that I have been pleased of hearing and he had already established himself and nothing he might add to it. The hon. gentleman has made criticisms on the question and over the action of the Government, and also on the C.P.R. such large lines, and also is well born in his own district. The hon. gentleman is not called the gerry-mander. He can be perfectly sure that the Government has left us just as we are accustomed to deal with matters that come before his House. We do not propose at this question on propheties at all. We do not propose to ask for representation for a population which may be here in the hereafter. We propose to deal with it as a business question. Sufficient unto the population of to-day is the representation thereof, and sufficient unto the population of to-morrow will be the representation of that day.

PSL OF TAX SALES.

The hon. gentleman complained of the unreasonableness of the bill of fare established in the Speech, which was the special topic of criticism of leaders of opposition. The Speech was fair as it did not affect the business of the country. It was thought to be for two good speeches from the mover and seconded and a long one from the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman carrying out the suggestion I made last year that he, being in the confidence of the corporations, is able to get information not otherwise obtainable.

since pressing for a settlement we have up to the present received no answer, we believe this is largely due to the illness of the Minister of the Interior, who has been absent from Ottawa almost since the session opened. I have an assurance from Sir Wilfrid Laurier that as soon as Mr. Sifton gets back an answer will be sent.

HON. MR. SCOTT CORRECTED.

The Government at Ottawa has, however, anticipated that answer somewhat by Hon. Mr. Scott's answer in the Senate. I can hardly credit the statement published of that answer as it showed little more ignorance on the part of that gentleman than on the displays in North-West affairs. In his reply to Senator Perley he is reported to have said that the cause of delay arose on account of the difficulty to decide whether there should be one province or several and the location of the capital. Everybody knows, or ought to, that the location of the capital will not be dealt with at Ottawa but by the first provincial legislature after a province is created and cannot, therefore, be one of the questions to be decided.

We have negotiated in person, by letter and by telegram. If the answer has not come in time, our fault. We cannot take the Dominion Government by the throat and carry out highway robbery methods. These might suggest themselves to members of the Opposition but are not the way the business of this Government is carried on.

THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION.

The Government has no desire whatever to withhold the fullest statement of its position from the members of this House or the people of the country. So far as could be done without divulging the negotiations while they were pending this has been done. And while there has probably been no formal statement by myself or anyone else on behalf of the Government, everyone in this House and country knows what the principal points are. It is not at all likely that the members of the Government in this House and on the platform should be speaking along certain lines, revealing certain topics, advancing certain arguments, and then going to Ottawa and giving them up. The members of this House have a pretty clear idea of what the Government thinks should be done. The papers will be brought down at the first possible opportunity. We regret the delay. We have put it in the mouth of the lieutenant governor, the strongest possible way under our system of government, that we regret the delay.

WHAT IS THE OPPOSITION POLICY?

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman says we have trifled with this matter, that we have done nothing, I will ask what have the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House been doing to develop public opinion on this question? What have they been doing towards educating the people on this question? The hon. gentleman has for the first time broken silence on this question and has had the hardihood to say that the people demand this provincial autonomy at once.

Mr. McDonald: I beg your pardon, it is not the first time.

Mr. Hautain: On what other occasion did you express an opinion on this question?

Mr. McDonald: In my speech in this House two years ago.

Mr. Hautain: In what way?

Mr. McDonald: I said it was time we had provincial autonomy.

Mr. Hautain: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement but I have no recollection of it. I am glad, however, to know that at intervals of two years there has been an attempt to raise on this important question. What did the hon. gentleman say when it was up? Was it that silence, I suppose indicating the unanimous approval of the Government? I do not know. He would be perfectly willing that a portion be handed over to Manitoba that western province could be formed.

The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that this is a growing position of the Government in the Qu'Appelle valley. I certainly congratulate the hon. gentleman on his new ally. I congratulate him that he stands on the same platform, or so nearly, that he can claim the support of the most active annexationist in the whole of Eastern Assiniboia. I must console myself with this fact, that if there is a growing opposition headed by Mr. Motherwell of the Qu'Appelle valley, the Opposition in this House is rapidly decreasing. (Laughter.)

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY.

On the one hand we have a clear cut opinion on the part of the Government; on the other side we have a number of opinions differing in every detail, differing in every important point on this most important question. As a consequence its leaders are placed in the position of not being able to say or do anything but simply maintain the position they held before. The hon. gentlemen attached to them, and there have been memorials and resolutions by the hon. gentleman as leader of the Opposition on matters not half so important. He has devoted himself to questions of half breed scrip and to asking questions with regard to the education of deaf and dumb children, and then when the question of scrip is settled he discovers a new one for the volunteers, a new law in the meantime. In the question the most important question the House will ever have to deal with has been up the hon. gentleman has sat mute and never had an opinion except once, say, two years ago and once to-day.

WHERE DOES THIS OPPOSITION STAND?

Not only the hon. gentleman, but where does his following stand on this important question? I suppose it would be somewhat indecisive for me to intrude into their little differences.

I would ask where does the hon. gentleman stand with his following? Where are other hon. gentlemen on this important question? What unanimity do they show what common opinion do they hold on this question? Take the hon. gentleman from Calgary West and see what he has to say about it. He said the time had come to consider all the phases of the question so that public opinion might be developed and kept. In that in this we are backed up by a loyal following in this House and knowing the justness of our claim we rest assured of the outcome. (Cheers.)

THE ALL IMPORTANT QUESTION.

Now with regard to the negotiations with the Federal Government over the question of provincial autonomy. We are not to blame if those negotiations are stretched out. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House think they have to do is write a letter to Ottawa to get your demands granted.

They will realise if ever they attain their ambition to sit on this side of the House that it requires a great deal more time than the other side of the House.

They will have to intrude into their little differences. I would ask where does the hon. gentleman stand with his following?

Where are other hon. gentlemen on this important question? What unanimity do they show what common opinion do they hold on this question?

Take the hon. gentleman from Calgary West and see what he has to say about it. He said the time had come to consider all the phases of the question so that public opinion might be developed and kept.

In that in this we are backed up by a loyal following in this House and knowing the justness of our claim we rest assured of the outcome. (Cheers.)

WANTS TWO PROVINCES.

Dr. Patrick (Yorkton) followed the premier and made a vigorous attack

on the one province idea.

He proposed to take advantage of the latitude which the debate offered to say many things which he regretted having to say.

Referring to the speech made by the Duke of Connaught London after his royal tour in which His Royal Highness spoke of the liberal laws of the colonies. Dr. Patrick said he surely had no reference to some legislation passed by this House last session which proposed to expropriate the property of free men and give them what compensation a commissioner might set.

Dr. Patrick then devoted himself to the provincial autonomy question. He said: I think I may safely claim to be open to the indictment made against others. It is nearly 15 years since I first had something to do with local politics. I was taken with the attitude of the premier that I followed him and have done so faithfully to this day. I was a strong believer in the one province idea and held these views up to 1897 because I believed that the assumption was correct that larger areas were more cheaply governed. I followed with a good deal of interest the debate on the autonomy motion of the member for Banff, but in 1897 the position was taken by Manitoba that it should include a part, I believe that position was taken by Manitoba as a protest against the debate here in 1896 when the unanimous resolution was passed in favor of one province. This led me to see that the position of Manitoba was such that they had a fair right to have some say in this matter. I felt then that the matter must be dealt with from a Dominion rather than a local point of view. In the session of 1898 I expressed the opinion that we should have two territories united under one local government. I made the suggestion in the hope that the leader of the Government would see his way clear to recede from a position I held to be dangerous to the people of this country.

Mr. Hautain: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.) What are you in favor of?

MR. HAUAIN: I am in favor of one province. (Hear, hear.)

I have said so in our memorial to Ottawa to invent our plan being adopted there.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.

Mr. McDonald: I did not express myself as to one or two provinces. (Laughter.)

Mr. Hautain: I am in favor of one province.