

last night, and it deals with that very point:

The matter of the boundary between the two provinces was discussed at great length. The matter of the number of constituencies was also discussed, and the method of division of the constituencies within each province was debated at considerable length.

I do not understand that the conference was of a confidential or private nature, and I may say that Mr. Haultain contended at great length and with some force that the number of constituencies should be thirty. He was unable to carry that point; the majority in the conference were in favour of a lesser number.

Mr. HERRON. Were the number of constituencies settled at that meeting?

Mr. SCOTT. Not absolutely. As a matter of fact we did not arrive at a perfect agreement either with regard to the boundaries or with regard to the number of constituencies. I have already told the House that my choice for a boundary line between the provinces was the present boundary of Alberta. I pressed that strongly. But I stood alone, and so I was driven to agree to the 4th meridian. A very substantial majority of those in the conference favoured the 4th meridian as against the 3rd meridian. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) reminds me that he favoured the 3rd meridian; but, the majority was in favour of the 4th, and that was finally adopted by the government. And I say that the number of constituencies was discussed at considerable length. Mr. Haultain contended, and with a good deal of force that the number of constituencies allotted to each province should be thirty, but he was unable to carry a majority of the conference with him. There was a discussion with regard to the method to be followed in the preparation of the schedules, and I repeat, though it has been emphatically denied by some hon. members opposite,—but my own memory with regard to this is supported by the memory of other hon. gentlemen present—that we did discuss the method of meeting Mr. Haultain's suggestion with regard to schedules, and I put forward a motion in favour of a bi-party committee representing each province to arrive at an agreement with regard to schedules. This was not carried. There are hon. gentlemen here who recollect distinctly that I made the motion. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) said that the absurdity of what I stated was proved by the fact that the boundary had not then been selected.

Mr. LALOR. Was the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Scott's) motion seconded?

Mr. SCOTT. Although there were Conservatives there, the motion was not even seconded. They did not seem to regard it as a proper suggestion to be followed.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to mention again, as I did yesterday, that Mr. Haultain stated to me yesterday that he was not present when the motion referred to was made—that he heard no formal motion.

Mr. SCOTT. That may be true, and it is undoubtedly true that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) was not present. I could not swear to the personnel of the Conservatives who were there at the moment when I made my motion, but I am perfectly satisfied that all the Conservatives who had been in the conference had not left. At all events, I certainly made the motion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I have said that I was not there when the motion was made. Perhaps I could jog the hon. gentleman's memory by asking him whether he remembers a telegram from W. R. Abbott, of Maple Creek?

Mr. SCOTT. The telegram that I handed to my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy)?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You gave me a copy.

Mr. SCOTT. That was before the conference opened.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No, I went down and sent the telegram to Calgary.

Mr. SCOTT. And returned to the room?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. SCOTT. My recollection is that this telegram incident occurred while the members were gathering. I showed the telegram that I received in regard to the boundary line from the secretary of the Maple Creek Board of Trade. But my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) said last night that it would have been absurdity to talk about delimiting the boundaries within the province before the line between the provinces was settled. There was no attempt made at this meeting to settle the delimitation of the boundaries, but we all talked over the question of the method by which Mr. Haultain's suggestion was to be met, of furnishing the government with schedules for both these provinces.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 12 be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has forgotten something. Allusion was made by the leader of the opposition to the speech of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) last night in which he took up the proposed province of Saskatchewan and showed that the principle of subdivision laid down by the Prime Minister would work out in the greatest absurdities. When allusion was made to that today, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deprecated mixing the provinces together in one discussion. But it was