

was present and at which I was present. Does he deny it? Is the hon. gentleman contradicting what I say?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I merely wish to say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OLIVER. I have the floor. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make a contradiction let him make it, and I will sit down; but I will not sit down to let him make a speech.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I simply desire to ask a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of the Interior take the ground that when a gentleman rises on the other side of the House and asks leave to ask him a question which has to do with an emphatic statement made by the minister, and which is denied on the other side, that he is going to stand on his rights and not allow it?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean to say that when I make an emphatic statement, if the hon. gentleman has any denial to make, I will sit down and let him make it.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) asked the hon. gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I asked him to deny my statement if he could. I stated that there was a meeting at which were present the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont), the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), at which the question of the division between the two districts was discussed, along with other questions in that connection, as stated by the hon. member for Alberta last night. Now, does he deny that?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does he mean the division between the two provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. Between the two provinces.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Well, so far as that goes, the minister is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. Thank you. I have only to say that when the hon. leader of the opposition rung the changes on the alleged fact that there was no conference—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not referring to a conference about the boundaries between the two provinces, I was talking of a conference respecting the delimitation of the ridings.

Mr. OLIVER. He was denying that there was a conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman surely knew what I was referring to, and what I expressly stated. There was no conference, so far as I am aware, certainly not with myself, respecting the delimitation of the ridings in either of the two provinces. That is what I said.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is certainly depending upon his legal ability.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not, I am depending upon the truth.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a question as to whether there was a conference in regard to the delimitation of the constituencies. We say that there was a conference called for that purpose, and when that conference met, the first duty was necessarily to decide as to the boundaries between the two provinces; and we found, during the conference, that we could not come to an agreement even on that point, nor on other points that were brought up at the conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the delimitation of the boundary brought up?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe it was brought up. The evidence on that point is the statement of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). I did not bring it up. I was not a party to the discussion in regard to it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did the hon. gentleman hear it brought up?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say I did, but I do say most emphatically that the conference was held with the view of discussing the delimitation of the constituencies once we had decided upon the delimitation of the boundaries of the province.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether the gentlemen who were invited to attend the conference were told of that. I certainly was invited to attend but I was not told that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the hon. member was told; I only know what I was told.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the hon. minister uses the expression 'with the view to' he is rather ambiguous. It may have been 'with the view to' in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but that is of no importance unless they communicated to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that that was their design.

Mr. OLIVER. The main point is that we, on both sides of the House, did come together amicably in regard to the preliminary feature of this question, and if the discussion was not carried further the fault was not with those of us who believed the conference was for the purpose of securing an amicable delimitation of the boundaries of the constituencies, and who were present on future occasions expecting to meet our friends on the other side, but who, as I said, were not there. I cannot answer for the reason why they were not there, but I say that the insinuation that there was any desire on our part to avoid a conference is not borne out by the facts.