

Saskatchewan to the proposed province of Alberta. Then continue the line northward until you reach the northern boundary of Athabaska. In that way you would equalize the area of the two provinces. To my mind it is not very material that they should be of the same area. I do not think we should sacrifice the interests of the people simply to give an equal area to each province. If there are other interests of paramount importance to that, there can be no reason why we should not have one province with even 50,000 square miles more than the other, if that will serve better the purposes of the people in that country. I endorse heartily the proposition of my hon. friend from Calgary. He has given a great deal of study to the question. He is not prejudiced in the matter; he is not bound hand and foot by any previous proposition; and in that respect he differs from the hon. gentleman, who made up his mind two or three months ago. The proposition of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) would turn very largely the ranching district into one province, so that the ranching laws could be dealt with by one province, and the laws relating more particularly to agriculture could be dealt with by the other province. It is a matter of importance that the ranching country should be as much as possible in the one province. I am still of the opinion that the proposition made by the hon. member for Calgary is the most practicable I have heard yet; and I would hope that the government would listen to it, even at the expense of having two provinces of somewhat different area, and thus meet the wishes of the people of the west. Surely some impression has been made upon hon. gentlemen opposite by the discussion to-day. I notice the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) looking very directly at me with rather a pleasant smile, and I take it, he is receiving my argument with some considerable degree of satisfaction. I hope he will not only listen to the argument, but give some consideration to this question. He is a representative of both Alberta and Saskatchewan, and not like the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). He is the representative in the government of that whole country, and should endeavour to act fairly between these two provinces and seek to establish the boundary line between the two, so as to consider in the best possible manner the interests of the people. If there is to be a vote on this question, I shall have no hesitation in supporting the proposition of my hon. friend from Calgary. Move the boundary line between those two provinces, eastward; extend it north to the Saskatchewan river; then extend it westward along the Saskatchewan, and thence run to the north. In that way the ranching country would be thrown mostly into the province of Alberta, and that province would have

the making of the laws regulating that peculiar kind of farming operations.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I beg to move in amendment:

That clause 1 of the Bill be amended by striking out lines 7, 8 and 9, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:

Thence northerly along the said eastern boundary of British Columbia to its intersection with the parallel of the 55th degree of north latitude; thence easterly along the said parallel of the fifty-fifth.

That is defining the northern boundary at the southern boundary of Athabaska. I think it would be better to keep Athabaska as an unorganized territory and to then organize the remaining territories of the Yukon, Mackenzie and Keewatin under a new territorial government, similar to that which these Territories now enjoy. I believe the two provinces will then be large enough. Or, I would agree with the suggestion made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) this afternoon, that the two provinces should be merged into one, or that Manitoba's boundaries should be extended westward and the remaining territory made into one province. But I certainly think that the northern boundary ought to be the southern boundary of the present territory of Athabaska, the 55th parallel.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad that the amendment has been moved. We have heard a good deal of talk to-day and yesterday. I do not wish to make any reflections, but I think it is very much better when hon. members come before the committee and put themselves on record by way of a motion rather than keep up what might be called a guerilla warfare from many different points of view. The amendment defines very closely, I think, the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, not only on this particular matter but on the subject of western development generally, and enables the House and the country to see how it happened that under the administration of these gentlemen our country in the west, as well as our country in the east, did not progress. It appears from the tenor of this motion that they have decided that, because the district of Athabaska at the present time contains only a small population and because a portion of that population are 'only' half-breeds, therefore that district is not entitled to representation either in the proposed provinces to be erected or in this Dominion parliament.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Cannot the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) give them representation in this parliament?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why?