

a costly thing to maintain two governments where one will do. After what has been said, I will take more time to consider the matter and prepare a uniform amendment for the third reading of the Bill, keeping in mind the ideas that we ought to have one province instead of two, that the present territory of Athabaska ought to be left in the Territories and the province of Manitoba enlarged. If Manitoba is enlarged, one province made out of the country south of the present territory of Athabaska, all the requirements of the country will be met and the people will have representation as well as taxation, notwithstanding what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said. As to the suggestion of the Prime Minister that we can not discuss the schedule that goes with the Bill, I take issue with him. The question of the boundary of the provinces involves the schedule. There may be a reason for making the boundary line as it had been made. I think I know what that reason is. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has been successful in an election in the district of Edmonton and hon. gentlemen opposite would like to have another constituency or two of the same character to the immediate north. There is a political object in view. There is no use in disguising it and it must be discussed. And these boundaries are based upon political considerations. The central division that is proposed, the northerly boundary, the making of two provinces, with two governments and all the patronage that goes with them—there are political reasons for all these things which we must be free to discuss. The discussion cannot be confined to a single point when others are implicated. We have the right to discuss these matters under the rules of the House. I ask leave to withdraw the motion I have made with the understanding that, on the third reading, if the Bill reaches the third reading, we will put it in form of a motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice one question. Is Athabaska under the present territorial government in any way, or has it a separate organization altogether?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It comes under the operation of the Northwest Territories Act, the territorial government extends to Athabaska.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not represented in the territorial legislature.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, only three districts are represented, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Assiniboia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I ask this for the reason that the ex-Minister of the Interior made a suggestion in the course of his speech that there was no particular reason, if you were going north of Alberta or Saskatchewan, why you should stop at the northern boundaries of Athabaska. I

will put my suggestion in another way. Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia are at present represented in the territorial legislature, they are in effect a territory which has a very large amount of self-government. Athabaska is a sort of appendage to that, I understand.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. An electoral district.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of the Interior suggested that the new province should extend to the utmost limit of the British possessions to the north, assigning as his reason that the Dominion government should as soon as possible divest itself of the local administration of those territories. I think those were his exact words, because they impressed me at the time. We are adopting a middle course which is perhaps not a very logical one. The member for Hamilton has made a perfectly logical proposition, and on the other hand there is a certain amount of reason for extension to the utmost confines of a British possession, in the north. But I have not been able to understand why, if you go beyond the territories which have local self-government at present, you should stop at Athabaska. I ask why, if you go beyond the northern boundaries of Alberta and Saskatchewan, you should not, as the ex-minister suggested, go to the northern limit of the British possessions. It does not seem to me there is any very good reason for a middle course, though, I can see a very plausible argument for adopting either one of the other courses suggested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The reason is this: What is to-day the district of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, as we well know, is chiefly an agricultural country and very little else. There are minerals at the foot of the Rocky mountains, some minerals on the prairies, but it is chiefly an agricultural country. The district of Mackenzie is not and never can be an agricultural country, so far as we know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that true of all of it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is true of all of Mackenzie so far as we know; it is only partly true of Athabaska. It is also true of Athabaska that a large portion of it is an agricultural country of the same character as Saskatchewan and Assiniboia. All the valley of the Peace river which is in Athabaska, so far as my information goes, is an agricultural country and can be developed as such. In that section of the Peace river which is in Athabaska there are to-day two grist mills of some importance, one I think erected within the last two or three years, and both of them supplied with wheat raised in the valley of the Peace river. That country is intimately connected with Alberta. As my hon. friend the Minister of

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.