

vinces in two ; while I do not propose to go at any length into the suggested dividing line, in view of what the right hon. gentleman has suggested to the House to-day, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not point out some of the objections that are coming from that country in regard to this proposed divided line. This line, I may say, is placed right in the heart of the ranching country. I have in my hand a map published by the Department of the Interior, and on which the ranching country in the Northwest Territories is shown, and from which it can be seen that but a very small portion of the ranching country is to be placed in the eastern province of Saskatchewan. The objection to that division is that the ranching country in that eastern province will have such small representation in the local House that its demands and its needs may not receive the recognition which they deserve. The people inhabiting that district have realized this, and so they sent their resolution of protest down to their representative in this House. Another objection which may seem of small concern to the people of the east, but which is very important to the people of the west, is that by placing a portion of the ranching territory in the eastern province there is a possibility that there will be a conflict in the branding laws, which would undoubtedly lead to great inconvenience.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is now discussing the terms of the Bill.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. We were told to-day by the Prime Minister that no objections had been raised to the Bill except as regards the educational clause and I want to show the right hon. gentleman that there are still other objections. I point him to the fact that there is no channel through which we could approach the government to make known our objections other than by open statements in this House of Commons, and so it devolves on us from the Northwest to call the attention of the government to some very important objections which the people of the west have to this Bill. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if I am out of order I will bow to your decision and desist. Let me however point out that another very strong objection raised against this Bill is, that the great northern country is being included in the new provinces. While we may have great hopes and aspirations for the future prosperity of that northern country yet the greater part of that territory is not agricultural, if we can accept as true the statement of the Prime Minister on introducing the Bill.

If we look at the census of 1901 it will be found that in the provisional district of Athabaska the population consists of 80 English ; 8 Irish ; 39 Scotch ; 105 French ; 7 Germans ; 2 Scandinavians ; 1 Belgian, or 142 white people in all. There were 2,393 halfbreeds, 3,716 Indians, 262 unspecified,

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY.

giving a total population for the district of Athabaska of 6,615. We remember that the Prime Minister when introducing the Bill discussed the question as to whether or not it was advisable to give Manitoba, with a population then of 10,000 a provincial status in 1870, and he suggested that it would have been better to allow them to mature by gradual process. If that view were sound in regard to Manitoba is it not equally applicable to-day to this great northern country ? Is there any great demand from that northern country to be included in any province ? I believe that they need and are entitled to the establishment of courts of law and a further measure of civil justice, but I have not heard there is any demand for autonomy in the district of Athabaska. Would it not be just as logical to add the Yukon to British Columbia or to add Keewatin to Ontario or to add Ungava to Quebec, as to add the district of Athabaska to the western province and extend that territory to the north ? There is this additional objection : that under the proposed autonomy Bill the provinces have no interest in the lands, mines, or minerals, and that is an important consideration when we are dealing with this phase of the measure. What would the members in this House from British Columbia, from Ontario and from Quebec say if the territories to the north of their provinces were to be given representation in the provincial legislatures and they were to be saddled with the cost of this administration under conditions similar to those on which Athabaska is to be included in the province of Alberta ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is plainly discussing the terms of the Bill, and that is out of order.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Then, Sir, it is my duty to point out to the First Minister the very serious inconvenience suffered by the people of the Northwest by reason of the fact that we have to-day, no Minister of the Interior. The right hon. gentleman has complained that no objections to the Bill have come from the Northwest save in respect to the educational clauses. Let me remind him, that there is no minister of the Crown representing the Northwest, to whom the people can transmit their grievances. I trust that the Prime Minister will at a very early day be able to assure us that the portfolio of the Interior will be filled. Day after day questions are asked in this House, which should be answered by a responsible Minister of the Interior ; day after day people are coming here great distances to interview the Minister of the Interior on matters seriously concerning the Northwest, but there is no Minister of the Interior to whom they can make their representations. It is true there is a very capable officer in the position of deputy minister, but, he has been so recently appointed