SECESSION

Shall the Territories Be Divided?

Mr. Haultain Emphatically Says, No! and Gives Good Reasons for His Answer—The Secessionists Admit Their Defeat, and Shirk a Vote.

In the "Memorial" debate in the Assembly, Messrs. Brett and Insinger spoke in the afternoon. At half-past five Mr. Magrath had the floor. He continued speaking half an hour after recess, and was followed by Mr. Fearon, whose speech was printed last week. It was about nine o'clock when the leader of the House rose to combat the plea of the secessionists.

MR. HAULTAIN

said that after the debate which took place in the afternoon he had not thought of taking up any of the time of the House, but it had taken a peculiar turn by reason of the amendment which had been put in,—a turn which had a particular personal application to several members of the House on account of their coming from Alberta, and considering the importance of the question at issue. He would refer to the amendment first and then proceed to make a few remarks with regard to the general line of debate which had been taken. The amendment was to the effect that the Assembly was of the opinion that until the Territories were admitted into confederation as two or more provinces, which they considered was necessary at an early date for the compact government on local lines of such a vast country, that the passage of a few amendments at the first session of the Parliament of Canada to the N.W.T. Act would allow them, subject to disallowance of their ordinances, to exclusively make laws in relation to matters already within their legislative jurisdiction. The amendment involved two questions. In the first place was the statement that the Territories should be divided into two provinces at an early date not particularly certain,—almost as vague as the words of the memorial; and in the second place that until that event became a fact,—until the Territories were divided into two provinces, they should practically remain as they were. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman who had framed the amendment had altogether followed out exactly what he meant. The memorial asked that they should remain as they were with regard to their legislative jurisdiction, but that they should have that jurisdiction considerably extended in many important matters. So that the amendment, in its prophetic allusion, was progressive so far as the practical question with which the House was concerned; but in the other part the amendment was a stand still, if not retrograde, and for that reason he would have to oppose the amendment. They had a large number of powers which at present were not complete, and in which, so far as those powers were concerned, and so far as other things which at present generally came within their legislative jurisdiction, they must look for an immediate extension,—not for a remote extension at the time when a province or provinces may be established. The memorial was the practical suggestion of a practical body with regard to the actual present needs of the Territories. The amendment said they wanted a certain number of provinces at an indefinite period, and then proceeds to state they really did not want anything more in the way of extension to their legislative jurisdiction, but were perfectly satisfied to remain as they were in that respect, except that present jurisdiction should be rounded out so far as it stands at present and be made complete. To his mind the amendment nullified one of the most important parts of the memorial,—that part which asked for the extension of their legislation jurisdiction, and for that reason could not commend itself to the House. No matter what the hon. member, the mover of the amendment, might believe with regard to what number of provinces they should have at a future day; no matter what any hon. member might believe to be the proper way of stating their position with regard to legislative rights and financial claims, he could not accept the position of the amendment which said they did not want anything more than they had now. The amendment was not practical, it did not settle anything, but it left everything for the consideration of the future. The whole subject connected with the memorial had been very sufficiently and very fully discussed during the afternoon—so far as the speech of the hon. gentleman from Yorkton was concerned, more fully and more ably discussed than any question he ever heard debated in that House. Therefore he (Mr. Haultain) would not attempt to take up the time of the House in dealing with the details of the memorial, or in dealing with their financial position. Those were fully set out in the memorial, and with which they all pretty well agreed. The question so far as the amendment was concerned, so far as any difference of opinion with the memorial was concerned, was a question of what should their institutions be? He went further and said it was a question of what should their institutions be now? not what they should be at some future date. That involved the question of whether they should have a single province, or whether they should debate the system proposed in the memorial of a gradual development of the present Territorial system until they arrived at such a point that they would be able to slide into confederation almost without knowing it. That question had been complicated by the amendment which meant that Alberta should be established into a province itself. As a member representing an Albertan constituency, he must take exception to the position assumed by the hon. member for Banff in undertaking to represent the views of Alberta. He (Mr. Haultain) denied any right on the part of the hon gentleman to attempt to represent what the opinions of the people of Alberta were except so far as those people were confined to the limits of his own electoral district. He might tell him, and other hon. gentlemen from Alberta, that he did not believe Alberta wished to be made a province. He did not believe there had been a proper statement of the feeling of Alberta to-day. He agreed with what the hon. gentleman from Lethbridge (Mr. Magrath) said, that if a poll were taken to-day in Alberta on the question of whether Alberta should be set aside as a province there would be a very large majority against it in spite of the efforts of the Alberta autonomy movement in Calgary. That movement originated in the town of Calgary in one sense. It was a very praiseworthy movement in so far as it called attention to certain important public matters and gave opportunity to consider the larger question of the form of government in the Territories. But on the other side, if he might judge from the propaganda of the movement in the shape of pamphlets, and from the speeches he had heard from prominent advocates of the movement, after all the movement was largely a very local one. They appealed largely to the desperate condition into which certain portions of Alberta had unfortunately fallen. He heard of large and visionary schemes on provincial lines by which millions of dollars were going to be raised in the money markets of the world, by which large public works were going to be undertaken, and in fact under the expenditure of which sums everyone was going to get work to be rich; to say nothing of the incidental fact that Calgary was going to be established as the capital of the future province, that public buildings were going to be built there; that the Assembly, or something like the present one, or better, was going to be established there; that there would be a completely planned civil service, and that Calgary should blossom out from its present condition into a full blown capital. That was the most practical argument he heard, but it was not a practical argument that appealed to him, or that should appeal to the members of that House, or to the people of Alberta when asked to take such an important step as to separate from the Territories. As a member from Alberta he was not prepared to advocate any scheme which meant the division of Alberta from the rest of the Territories and making it into a province. Considering the practical interests of the country, considering the practical work they had to do, he did not feel disposed to be asked to express an opinion upon the subject. The gentlemen who had advocated Alberta autonomy that day in the House did not go any nearer than saying it was something to be hoped for in the near future, whatever that might be. Why, therefore, should the House be asked to spoil a memorial which dealt with their present needs; which dealt with their undoubted rights and the righteous demands they wished to make with regard to their immediate surroundings and their everyday institutions? Why should he be called upon to express an opinion with regard to something which was simply anticipatory of a movement which might take place at some future date, as the hon. gentleman put it in his amendment. The hon. gentleman from Banff referred to the present connection of Alberta as a partnership in a firm, and said that member of the firm wished to withdraw. He (Mr. Haultain) did not know exactly what the hon. member meant when he spoke of a partnership existing between what was one single united country, and he believed would remain so. The diversity of interests which existed between various parts of the Territories had been spoken of as giving a good and strong ground for dividing the Territories up. What sort of a province did the hon. gentleman wish it to be? Did they want to have one sheep farm, or one wheat field, or one sort of a field devoted to some other sort of industry which their own insignificance would allow them to describe? If they wished to have a good strong province, strong in its own resources, they should have a diversity of resources (hear, hear.) Much better than having a comparatively small amount of land devoted to one or two interests would it be if they could have a very large area such as the organized Territories were to-day with their diversity of interests, but not conflict of interests. They should look forward to having a very much stronger and better province than there would be if they had to be divided up. Was there as much diversity of interest or conflict of interest, if they liked to use the expression, between the most remote portions of the Territories as there was between any sections of the older provinces? There was no conflict. He did not think any member of the House could state that at any time in the history of the House there was any conflict of interest between those portions of the Territories known as Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan. He believed there was a Saskatchewan question at one time, but that lost a large amount of its significance in the comprehensive term "in other respects," so he was safe in saying there was no conflict of interest, at least very apparent. Hon. gentlemen who had argued with regard to the establishment of a small and weak province such as Alberta would be, look at the analogous cases of Manitoba, British Columbia and other provinces. In the first place they were not analogous. Manitoba was not taken into confederation under the same circumstances as the Territories would be taken into confederation. Manitoba was taken in as a political necessity. In one sense they hoped the Territories to be taken in as a political necessity, but not in the same sense. In talking of two sides to a bargain, British Columbia when taken into confederation had a distinct say as to the terms upon which they would enter. On the other hand when they of the Territories were talking about two sides to a bargain, their position now and for a long time to come would be that, although they were in one sense one of the contracting parties, in reality the other contracting party had all the say, because it had all the power; so that the analogy between the terms of entrance into confederation either between British Columbia or Manitoba did not hold good. The hon. gentleman had referred to direct taxation. If they did not have direct taxation they certainly could not have enough money for carrying on their business. They either had to have direct taxation or they must have a municipal form of government under which people would levy the burdens upon themselves, if they would be a successful province. It was very easy to take, as the hon. gentleman from Banff did, a sheet of paper and with a few figures make a fortune out of them. The figures did not lie, but the average man who relied on the figures was very apt to find he was very much mistaken. The figures did not lie, but all the practical questions involved in those figures had to be taken into consideration. Upon the credit of what would any large sums of money be raised in the proposed province of Alberta? Not upon lands, because there were not going to be any lands; not upon minerals, because the minerals went with the lands and were already taken up by Federal authorities; so that when hon. gentlemen indulged in fanciful figures in regard to large loans of money they should take one step further and explain exactly how they expected to raise those large sums of money. He did not think practical men living in Alberta had had any large opportunity of seeing that capital was particularly anxious to flow into the Territories. When hon. gentlemen talked about borrowing large sums of money they were simply begging the question and ignoring the practical side which precluded the possibility of any such loans being raised for a very long time to come. The hon. gentleman's argument with regard to the compactness of the province or provinces, and with regard to the desirability of having comparatively small areas formed into provinces, might be considered. The reference to the policy of the United States with regard to their Territories, was not a reference which should have great weight in that House. So far as they knew anything about American institutions, he (Mr. Haultain) thought that was not exactly the part of the world to which they were going to look for precedents. If the States liked to cut up their country into comparatively small territories, presumably they did so for some reason, but not, he thought, for the reason advanced by the hon. member for Lethbridge. At what points were they going to draw an arbitrary line and say "at this point facility for governing this country ceases?" There were no great natural obstacles to communication in this country. They could communicate with the most remote parts in a rapid manner either by railroad or telegraph, so at what points would they draw that imaginary line? for after all it was a geographical line drawn arbitrarily without any reference to any known number at all, and no proposition involving such a division could commend itself to that House as being based upon any sound principle, or even on good common sense. The argument with regard to those narrow limits, and the special rights which exist within those narrow limits, seemed to be a decidedly provincial argument. He used the expression advisedly. He was not opposed to the formation of a province, but he hoped hon. gentlemen who went in for the formation of a province would not take the other meaning of the term and indulge in arguments which could only be called both narrow and provincial. If they were going to confine themselves at once to the particular rights or particular claims of smaller portions of this country they might take the position proposed by the hon. members from Banff and Lethbridge, and cut the whole country into small plots so that every man might be a province unto himself with three acres and a cow. But it seemed to him they should take the larger point of view, and not be bound by the narrow selfish interests and claims, so-called, of any particular portions of the Territories. The hon. member from Lethbridge referred repeatedly to the fact that they were over-governed. He (Mr. Haultain) believed the hon. gentleman was perfectly right. (Laughter.) They had heard about the movement going on now in the maritime provinces. He had not heard that it had taken any very definite shape, but he believed there was a feeling in the maritime provinces at least that they were over-governed; that having three small provincial governments instead of one strong government weakened their influence. But the hon. member from Lethbridge, when telling them about that state of being over-governed in the Dominion, proceeded, not in the most logical way, to recommend that they should follow the analogy of other parts of the Dominion by cutting up these Territories necessarily into a large number of small areas for the purposes of government. It would simply mean duplication, or triplication, or some other quantity of governments, of legislatures, of institutions of all sorts. In fact all of the larger institutions of the machine would simply be increased just so many times as the number of provinces it was decided there should be, without, so far as had been shown, any benefit being derived from it. For that reason, then, why should they have two or more small provinces when one good strong province would do for all the Territories when the time for a province had come? He believed they should have one province, but that they need not have it yet. He believed they should go on, as they had been going on, with the gradual development of their present institutions, here and there gaining a little more power, here and there extending their jurisdiction, here and there getting more money. These were the practical questions for consideration, and that very discussion showed that they were not prepared to make any definite claim with regard to provincial questions. The very fact that there were three sets of opinions expressed in the House showed they were not prepared to discuss the provincial question with a view to its immediate institution. They had very difficult questions to be settled when formed into a province, questions with regard to their lands and many other matters. The hon. gentleman from Banff, the other day, in addressing the House referred to the undignified position the Territories occupied through the annual pilgrimages which had to be made to Ottawa to ask for more money. If such an attitude was an undignified attitude for them in their present undeveloped position, what word should he use to describe a similar proceeding on the part of the representatives of a full blown province, because that was what the hon. gentleman admitted must be done? If they were going to have a province established at once they were not going to get what they thought they ought to get, and they would be obliged to do exactly what Manitoba had been obliged to do, and would be obliged to do,—to make those annual pilgrimages, only it would be very much more undignified to go down to Ottawa on behalf of the province and make those annual claims than it was merely for a member of that House, who happened to be a member of the Executive Committee, to go down to Ottawa from year to year, simply to say, "we have no agreement with you, we do not want to make any agreement with you, but we want to get better terms, and we consider we are entitled to better terms?" So far as the argument of the annual pilgrimages was concerned the hon. gentleman had better not have made reference to it. The Territories had gradually demanded and had gradually taken, quietly, it was true, but not the less effectually, larger powers into their own hands. They had developed the Executive Committee, an institution which was their own creation, and had practically put into the hands of men responsible to the House almost all the administrative business of the Territories. They had been going on gradually until they had at least arrived to-day very nearly the position of a province so far as administrative business was concerned. The memorial stated very clearly the difference between their present position and that of a province. It went on to say they wanted further powers with the one exception that they did not want to be allowed to assume a debt which might complicate the provincial question later on, and they did not want to be admitted into confederation simply because they did not feel prepared to discuss the terms of being admitted into confederation. The memorial enabled them to go on gradually developing their institutions, gradually practising self government until they had arrived at the time when they were fully enabled to negotiate with the stronger body at Ottawa in regard to the important questions he had mentioned. He did not think he need waste time in urging upon the House that they were not ready to go into negotiations. There were questions which demanded a large amount of negotiation and which unfortunately were settled not so much on principles of right and justice, but more with respect to the amount of political pressure which could be brought to bear upon the Ottawa authorities. He defied any hon. member to say they were prepared by virtue of their representation at Ottawa, or by virtue of the strength of the Territories in population, or in any other respect, to go to Ottawa and negotiate with the authorities there for entrance into confederation. What they wanted was autonomy. Autonomy meant power to govern themselves. Their jurisdiction was subject to continual incursions of Federal legislation. They made a useful law, and sometimes an Act was passed at Ottawa which rendered useless their own legislation. They wanted to be put in the position of a province of passing laws coming within their own jurisdiction, but wished to defer the settlement of the very difficult and complicated question as to the terms upon which they should enter into confederation. To go further than that, they were met with this fact staring them in the face, that they were not agreed upon what they wanted to be in the future. Some wanted one province, some wanted two provinces, and possibly before they had gone much further they might find a claim for a province somewhere on the banks of the Saskatchewan. In view of the fact that the most ardent advocate of provincial autonomy was not prepared to show what he really wished to do, why should they complicate the consideration of practical questions which concerned their everyday needs, which came up every day, and concerned them to-day, and would continually, until that province or those provinces had been established,—why should they complicate their position in the discussion of something upon which there were so many differences of opinion, and in the discussion of a question which could not be practically settled that night? They might as well drop that subject and get down to business. Their business was, What did they want for the present time, both with regard to their constitution and with regard to their finances, not what they wanted for the future with regard to their constitution, and upon which they were not agreed. Let the reference in the memorial as to what they wanted be as explicit and as implicit as possible, but let them be unanimous as to what they want just now. The hon. gentleman from Lethbridge said in his amendment that they should stand still until the change was made.

Mr. Magrath: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I say nothing of the kind.

Mr. Haultain (reading the amendment): What I say is, the amendment as it reads is subject to only one construction, and that is that it proposes that we should stand still until two or more provinces are established. Of course, continued Mr. Haultain, if the hon gentleman did not intend that, he (Mr. Haultain) was very glad, but that was the only meaning he could give the amendment if it meant anything at all. If it meant something else——

Mr. Magrath: I certainly cannot see it.

Mr. Haultain proceeded that if the amendment did not mean that, he did not see what it did mean. He thought if they could be unanimous upon what they wanted, and upon what they had a right to have, they could agree to disagree with regard to what their future was going to be. Their present position demanded a remedy at once. The memorial set that out much more eloquently than anything he could say. Therefore let them set aside the larger question which was for the future, and turn their attention to the practical needs of the present moment. He thought he need not address an argument to the House to be unanimous. If they were not unanimous they need not hope for anything from Ottawa. If the hon. member for Banff between now and next session advocated the Alberta autonomy movement he would at least do a great deal of good in calling attention to the system under which the Territories were now working. It might be a very good educative movement, and he (Mr. Haultain) certainly would not object to it, but if dreams were to be dreamed, and if visions were to be seen, they had better be dreamed and better be seen outside of that House, which after all had only to do with practical work. If however they were going to consider the larger subject it should be a little larger that the comparatively small area of Alberta and Saskatchewan, for after all those names were only applied for post office purposes. Their consideration of their needs on that question should be just as broad as the whole of the Territories. And if they were going to dream a dream, the dream he would like to dream would be the dream of one large province with all its varied resources; a dream of one large province with a united population, and not a divided population; and if that dream could come true he believed it would be a much better dream, and a much more desirable dream than the dream which was dreamed by the hon. member for Banff. A dream of one large province holding its own in confederation, the most powerful province in confederation, would be a much more desirable thing to think about, and to speculate about, than a number of small areas confined in their powers and in their influence. The dream he would like to dream would be the dream of the largest province and the most powerful province in the greatest and most glorious country attached to the mightiest empire the world had ever seen. (Applause.)

MR. CLINKSKILL

(Battleford) said the committee in considering the report as contained in the memorial, had decided that there were three possible propositions to bring up in the matter. One was the consideration of bringing the whole of the Territories into one province; or two or more provinces, and the third was the consideration of an enlargement of their powers as they were at present. In regard to the idea of asking for provincial rights the committee were not in a position very well to understand what was meant by the expression "provincial autonomy," as it had been used by some members of the House. The committee endeavored to find out their views, but were unable to find any union amongst them as to what they really wanted. Some did not want a province at all, they had no idea of provincial rights; some would be willing to take a province provided they took in half of Assiniboia and half of Saskatchewan, and made them a province; others would be willing to go in as a province provided Athabasca was taken in. But the committee could not come to any conclusion as to whether those hon. members were able to agree as to what they meant by provincial autonomy. Under the circumstances the committee agreed that the best thing they could do would be to embody their ideas which would be making a step forward in the position in which they now were. Regarding the powers asked for in the memorial the committee had endeavored to ask for those powers which it would be for their advantage to have. Powers they did not wish to have they had not embodied in the report. He would refer especially to the point of borrowing money and the administration of criminal jurisdiction. As far as the arguments of the hon. member for Banff were concerned he did not think they moved in the right direction to convince that they had necessity to consider the question of asking for full provincial rights yet. That must come some day they were all agreed. The amendment proposed did not find fault with any of the propositions embodied in the memorial, it was not finding fault with any of the powers asked for, it was simply brought up on a few words contained in one of the clauses, which was brought in in parenthesis, the printing of which would indicate that it was simply a reference to a condition which they would be in at some future date, when they would be in a position to ask for provincial powers for one, two, or more provinces. The fact of those words being in did not bind that it should be one province, or two, or any number at all. In the N.W.T. they had been for some time gradually moving towards increased powers. The powers that had been granted to them had been exercised with judgment and with good result. The argument had been brought forward that they should ask for a great deal more than they expected. He took issue with that. If they put forward claims on just principles and gave good sound reasons in support of them, they would be more likely to get what they wanted than if they asked for something which they could not justify. It had been said they had made progress slowly. He admitted they had not got the powers they asked for immediately, but they had had a change of administration at Ottawa, and it might be that the new administration would be more friendly to them than the past had been. Time would show. But no matter what administration was acting at Ottawa, whether Conservative or Liberal, there was always a thing hanging over those Governments, and that was shortness of money, and they would doubtless find that it did not matter what administration it was, they would always be inclined to keep as much of the money in their own hands as possible. That was to say, they would not be willing to give the Territories any more money than they were entitled to, and it was necessary for them all the more decidedly to show what they actually required, and they were not asking more than they could make use of. As to the development of the coal fields in Alberta, that would be very largely dependent upon the population of the Territories. It was all very well to say they could get a large market in the south, but there was between them and the south a wall of tariffs, and there was every prospect that that wall would be built higher every day, so that it would be a handicap upon the Alberta coal fields as regards markets. It would be better for Alberta to aid in getting the population into the Territories which would give a market for the minerals of Alberta and which would result in getting the population into Alberta, and that again result in consuming the productions of the Territories. As regards the borrowing of money on public credit, he might say that in order to do that, they must have good security. He could not see where the money was to come from, if they had a province such as Alberta, except from direct taxation, and direct taxation was always a cry which tended to keep population from going into the country. The freer they could make a country as far as direct taxation was concerned, the more likely they would be to get population. The hon. member for Banff instanced a cry that came from Saskatchewan for provincial autonomy. He (Mr. Clinkskill) did not know that the hon. member was referring to anything except that once upon a time a very slight wail was heard to come from that vast territory, but it was of such a very weak nature that it never reached very far, and they had heard nothing of it since that one time it was given expression to. He could not talk for the people of Saskatchewan in the same way the hon. member talked for the people of Alberta, but he did know that he was in favor of one province and not of two, and he was in favor of a gradual development of the powers they had until the arrival of the time when the step into a province would be a very short step to take. He could not follow the hon. gentleman's figures. He showed that 78 per cent. of the revenue was got from Alberta and 30 per cent. was spent on schools. He (Mr. Clinkskill) was very sorry to hear the hon. member from Yorkton accused of levity in speaking of that matter. The charge of levity should have been raised against the hon. member for Banff for raising the argument that the country used so much on the one hand, and on the other hand spent so little in a proper direction. Certainly he (Mr. Clinkskill) did not think that was an argument in favor of a people being allowed full provincial powers. He was sorry the hon. member for Banff had not by this time come to reason, and was not assisting them in that progress which was desirable. At one time the hon. gentleman's career in that House was directly opposed to the progress of the House, and the move he was making now was nothing different from the stand he took at that time. The development that had taken place in their powers in the Territories, they had not to thank the hon. member for Banff for. In conclusion he (Mr. Clinkskill) said he was in favor of all the claims laid down in the memorial. He would like to have those granted, and he would like to say that if they be not granted, or were not granted at an early day, he would be in favor of one province but not of two provinces. (Hear, hear).

By permission of the House

MR. BRETT

was allowed to speak. He said it would occur from the remarks just made by the hon. gentleman from Battleford that it was heresy, or taking a stand against everything that was good and right in the direction of the progress of this country, to bring up a question that he (Mr. Brett) thought was an important one. However, the point of view raised by the amendment was not one that was not without suggestion. If hon. gentlemen would read the paragraph in the memorial upon which the amendment was based, they would see there was practical invitation to the House to discuss one or more vital questions. There was an invitation there to discuss distinctly the principle involved in the amendment. It distinctly stated "one or more." If there happened to be a number of gentlemen in the House who conscientiously believed that when the time does come for the division of the Territories, and that it should not be a question of one but of two, it was a proper thing and a proper time to discuss that in the frankest and fullest manner. That was the reason the amendment had been presented. So far as being unanimous, he dared say the House could be made perfectly unanimous. He did not think there was a dissenting voice in the House with reference to the memorial generally speaking, but there was a difference of opinion with reference to whether there should be one or two provinces. The hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Haultain) wished the House to understand that if the amendment was accepted it would practically nullify the whole of the memorial. If the amendment did that then most undoubtedly the clause as it appeared in the memorial nullified the balance of it. The amendment anticipated going on for some time at least on the lines indicated by the memorial, only that it asked that amendments be passed at next session of Parliament at Ottawa. So that the amendment aimed at really being immediately progressive in that direction while the memorial did not. It had been asked, on what credit would the province of Alberta borrow money? He answered, on precisely the same kind of credit as Manitoba borrowed money. Manitoba had no lands to pledge any more than they had; she pledged the credit of the province in its future, on the public buildings already existing and hereafter to be built, and Alberta could take the same basis of credit, only with this difference, that Alberta would have a very much larger country, if the extent of country was to be taken into consideration.

MR. INSINGER,

in speaking to the amendment, said he did at one time suggest to the hon. member for Banff that the amendment would better have come up as an amendment to the memorial as a whole. If it was not opposed to the memorial, then the hon. member must take the horn of the alternative and profess that it did not mean anything at all. The amendment should have been brought in either as an amendment to the whole memorial, or as a separate resolution.

MR. SIMPSON

(Red Deer) said he thought the member of the House had no differences of opinion as to the memorial, and as to the difference between the memorial and the amendment, for his part he would be in favor of the memorial as it stood.

MR. McCAULAY

(Edmonton) said he had received a good deal of information from listening to the debate. While he was very sorry to find out that Alberta had been charged with being so——intemperate, he might say (laughter) he had often heard it said that the people in the N.W.T., and especially in Alberta, were cheerful drinkers, yet he did not know they could be charged with so much in that line. But with regard to educational matters he thought they were up with the times, that they kept pace with the other parts of the Territories, and he was sorry to hear the insulting remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton respecting that matter.

Mr. Insinger: I simply tried to explain away certain things which the hon. member for Banff had said; but to charge me with having insulted Alberta because I tried to explain away certain insulting references by the hon. member for Banff is wrong. I accepted the actual statement of the hon. member for Banff, and any reflection upon that statement should not be made towards me, but to the hon. member who made the statement.

Mr. McCaulay: I will then charge the hon. member with repeating what the hon. member for Banff did say. (Roars of laughter.) While I accept that with a good grace and think any hon. member in this House should accept any statement there is one thing: when it comes down to charging Alberta with 'committing three-quarters of the crime committed in the Territories, I draw the line there. (Hear, hear.) Continuing Mr. McCaulay said that while there was very little difference, as far as he could see, in the amendment and the memorial, he thought that they all agreed that the time had not arrived for provincial autonomy. When then should they quarrel or differ over a section where it said "one, two, or more?" When the time came it would be time enough to decide whether it should be "one or two or more." Therefore he could not agree with the amendment. He would rather see one good province than two poor ones. He had made up his mind to support the memorial as it stood. (Applause.)

MR. REID

(Prince Albert West) said that after the expression made use of by the hon. member for Macleod that he expected to hear an expression from the borders of Saskatchewan as to provincial rights, he might say that they heard nothing of provincial rights from there. There had been, some time ago, a wail from there, as the hon. member for Battleford had said, but it was buried in the back woods. He thought they were going on satisfactorily in the Territories and that the memorial was in the right direction. It had taken the Territories 20 years to reach the present stage and he thought it would, at the present rate of progress, be 20 years more before they were ready for provincial autonomy.

Mr. Magrath: For fear of losing the little support I had in connection with this amendment, I will, with the permission of the House, withdraw it.

Leave was given, and the amendment was withdrawn.

The House then went into committee of the whole at 10:45. Progress was immediately reported. The memorial passed a second and third time, was concurred in, and a resolution adopted to the effect that His Honor the Lieut.-Governor be asked to forward the memorial to the Governor-General-in-Council.

Adjournment of the House took place at 10:50.

Queen Top Draft Heating Stove

AGENTS WANTED.

Absolutely air tight. *Never require to remove the ashes only once every two months.* Will keep fire on one large stick or nut 48 hrs. No ashes or dust can get out on the floor. *We guarantee to heat a room 80 ft. square in 10 min. the coldest day in year.* It is the most powerful heating stove in the world; made of genuine Russian iron (best iron in the world); steel lined and steel bottoms. No cast iron to burn out. Can be relined by any tinsmith in any place; no running 1000 miles to maker who owns patterns for new lining. Will take a stick 24 inches by 10 inches diameter; will save 25 to 50 per cent. fuel. Size of stove, 18x25 in. on top and 22x27 in. at bottom. Will burn large knots, chunks, chips, brush, cobs, trash, straw and sawdust. Can build fire in *one min.*

We Lead the World on Draft and its Control.

AGENTS WANTED. Exclusive Territory Given.

We guarantee all we claim or no sale.

SOLE Patentees and manufacturers,

MEYER BROS.,

87 Church St., Toronto.

THE "BIG" FOUR.

A Quartette of Remedies that are Effecting Wonderful Cures.

Dr. Chase's four great remedies are: Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills, Dr. Chase's Ointment, Dr. Chase's Catarrh Cure, and Dr. Chase's Syrup of Linseed and Turpentine, his latest and greatest discovery for all throat and lung affections.

"I was sick for three years," says James Simpson, of Newcomb Mills. "I tried various alleged patent cures and several boxes of a certain pill which has been greatly cracked up. I got no relief. Then I tried Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills. Since, I have been able to work every day and feel like a new man. Your pills alone cured me at a cost of 25c."

"I have been subject to severe colds every fall and spring," says Miss Hattie Delaney, of 174 Crawford street, Toronto. "I used many cough medicines, but none cured me until at a cost of 25 cents I tried Dr. Chase's Syrup of Linseed and Turpentine."

"My husband was troubled with the worst kind of piles," writes Mrs. Jane Potts, of Meyersburg. "He was often unable to work. Since using your Chase's Ointment he is completely cured. It is truly worth its weight in gold instead of the price you charge, only 60 cents."

"I bought a box of your Catarrh Cure for 25 cents at Mr. Boyle's drug store here," says Henry R. Nichells of 176 Rectory street, London, Ont. "I am thankful to say it cured me."

Chase's remedies at all dealers. Edmanson, Bates & Co., manfrs., Toronto.

SOLD BY ROBERT MARTIN.

YOU'LL FIND IT IN WAGHORN'S GUIDE

DROPPED DEAD!

Suddenly Stricken Down by Heart Disease.

"A sad and sudden death occurred to a well-known citizen on one of the leading streets this morning."

Nearly every large city paper contains daily some such heading. The number of deaths from heart failure is very large, but it is only when they occur in some public and sensational manner that general attention is drawn to them.

Palpitation and fluttering of the heart are common complaints. With the heart itself there is nothing radically wrong. But the system is disorganized, the kidneys and liver are out of order, and the stomach is not in condition to do its work porperly. Between them all, they throw too much responsibility on the heart, and the latter is unable to stand the strain.

A box of Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills at a cost of 25 cents will regulate the system, purify the blood and make a new person of every sickly man, woman or child.

Dr. Chase's Liver-Kidney Pills may be had from any dealer or from the manufacturers, Edmanson, Bates & Co., Toronto. One pill a dose, one cent a dose.

Dr. Chase's Linseed and Turpentine is and colds. Largest bottle on the market; only 25 cents.

SOLD BY ROBERT MARTIN.

CURED OF CHRONIC CATARRH.

A Remarkable Cure.—J. W. Jennison Gilford, spent between $200 and $300, in consulting doctors; tried Dixon's and all other treatments but got no benefit. One box of Chase's Catarrh Cure did me more good than all other remedies, in fact I consider myself cured, and with a 25 cent box at that.—Sold by R. Martin.

EPPS'S COCOA

ENGLISH BREAKFAST COCOA

Possesses the following Distinctive Merits:

DELICACY OF FLAVOR.

SUPERIORITY in QUALITY.

GRATEFUL and COMFORTING to the NERVOUS or DYSPEPTIC.

NUTRITIVE QUALITIES UNRIVALLED.

In Quarter-Pound Tins and Packets only.

Prepared by JAMES EPPS & CO., Ltd., Homœopathic Chemists, London, England.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.

WINTER EXCURSIONS.

For accommodation of people who have to leave the rigorous climate of the North-West Excursion tickets are now on sale to

CALIFORNIA

A land now clad in the freshest verdure of spring.

Tourist car accommodation through.

First class sleeping accommodation at lowest rates.

Passengers desirous of a short refreshing voyage can take one of our splendidly equipped Steamers from Victoria, or can go one way returning the other.

Excursions to

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS

The Paradise of the Pacific. An Island of perpetual summer.

Excursions to

JAPAN

The land of flowers, fans, and butterflies.

European passages going via C.P.R. his choice of five Atlantic ports and twelve lines Ocean Steamships.

Steamers for Belfast, Glasgow, Liverpool, Southampton and the Continent every Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

LOWEST RATES.

Quickest time to Kootenay.

Rossland, Nelson, Sandon and the Slocan country reached in 2½ days. No stop-overs.

Apply to your nearest agent for pamphlets descriptive of all countries or write to

THOS. E. BIRBECK, Agent, Regina,

or to

ROBERT KERR, Traffic Manager, Winnipeg.

AVOID WORRY AND CARRY A WAGHORN AT BOOKSTORES, TRAINS WAGHORN 50c YOU'LL FIND IT IN WAGHORN'S GUIDE YOU'LL FIND IT IN WAGHORN'S GUIDE