

miles; Beaver mouth to Glacier, 24 miles; Glacier to Revelstoke, 35 miles; Revelstoke to Salmon arm, 52 miles; Salmon arm to foot Shuswap lake, 20 miles; foot Shuswap lake to bend above Kamloops, 30 miles; bend above Kamloops to Ashcroft, 52 miles; Ashcroft to Lytton, 36 miles; Lytton to Hope, 62 miles; Hope to Port Moody, 62 miles; total, 437 miles. The railway mileage from Stephen to Port Moody is 508 miles. It will be seen that an error would be incorporated if the railway mileage was taken to calculate area of belt, the difference is owing to crooks in line—71 miles.  $437 \times 40 = 17,480$  square miles. When near coast, for 30 miles from Port Moody, only 10 miles in width can be obtained to south of line owing to international boundary, a deduction of 300 miles. Another deduction of 10 per cent must be made for lands alienated—and it is to be borne in mind that such alienated lands represent the best of the lot. Making these two deductions from the total of 17,480, we get 15,462 square miles, and multiplying this by 640 (the number of acres to a square mile) we get an acreage of 9,895,680, to which we must add 3,000,000 acres given in Peace River, making a total of 12,895,680 acres, or, for convenience, say 13,000,000 acres. It will be noticed that no deductions are made for water areas, nor have any been taken out of area of Alberta, which is 160,000,000 acres. For this 13,000,000 acres in British Columbia \$100,000 was paid annually to the provincial government, and this land is in the Rocky mountain belt. There is no comparison of the treatment and there is discrimination against the new provinces. Thus, I desire some information as to why the government should only estimate the lands in that country at 25,000,000 acres if there are no waste lands, and no explanation has been given as to that. Until these figures are brought down and some information or knowledge given the House as to how the government arrived at the amount, it is practically impossible for us to discuss the matter on an intelligent basis.

Mr. BOLE. I wish to ask the hon. gentleman if, in his opinion, the sum set out now for the government of the provinces is sufficient or insufficient?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In my opinion it is insufficient. It is not, however, a question of sufficiency or insufficiency. I have stated my position in regard to these lands before in this House. It is not only the allowance we are getting for the lands; there are other inconveniences to which we are subjected by reason of the determination of the Dominion administration to retain the lands. I have, however, gone over that ground fully before and I do not propose to do so again. But I will say that the chief of these inconveniences is the distance which we are from the seat of

government. The hon. gentleman may not know it, but we cannot amend even our Mechanics Lien Act or any Act dealing with lands at all without coming down to this parliament. Another objection is the small representation we have in parliament at present. We have only ten members here from that country to-day, whereas if the lands were left in the hands of the local administration we would have fifty members looking after the administration of those lands for the benefit of the people. Another objection is we may have, by the retention of these lands here, a check on local enterprises. What is there to be gained by these provinces in assisting the developing of coal mines for instance, which is only one instance. There is no inducement for them to assist or encourage any local development. But as I have already fully stated my views, I do not propose to detain the House discussing them again. Let me say that the action by this government is contrary to the principles they have hitherto preached. It is contrary to their policy of decentralization. As Mr. Blake says, it is overturning the principles of the union; and as Mr. Mackenzie said, the very year the release was taken from the Hudson Bay Company, no person will pretend that after we have a government in these Territories, we will continue to administer these lands from Ottawa. That is the position I take.

Mr. BOLE. I have no right to make any suggestion to my hon. friend as to the line of argument he should take; but it seems to me that if he thinks the sums allowed are not sufficient for the requirements of the new provincial governments, he should confine his argument along that line, because the amendment eliminates the whole question of acres and dollars and so forth from the Bill. In view of that fact, the hon. gentleman should confine himself to discussing the sufficiency or otherwise of the sum set apart for the purposes of these provincial governments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is looking at the basis on which this legislation was introduced in the first instance. That basis is this. Inasmuch as the public lands in the said provinces are to remain the property of Canada, there shall be paid by Canada to the said provinces, by way of compensation therefor, a sum based on the estimated value of such lands. That is very simple and plain. Then it goes on to state what that sum is. My hon. friend from Calgary is arguing that that sum is not a fair value, if you take the lands as a basis; and notwithstanding the statement of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), I have not yet heard from the Prime Minister any announcement of policy different from that con-