

that the constituency of Calgary yields more per acre than the constituency of Edmonton, and yet he says it is not a grain country."

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to argue as between Calgary and Edmonton, but I merely say again, as I know his constituency, I think, certainly as well as he does, that the settlement of Vermilion, on the Peace river, is a settlement in which the people depend more entirely upon the results of the cultivation of the ground than does any settlement in the constituency which he represents. That is not saying anything as to the respective values of the two sections. I merely say that it is a strictly agricultural settlement situated on the lower Peace river, that there is a roller process flour mill run by steam, lighted by electricity, turning out flour for the northern trade equal to any that is produced in any part of the district of Alberta.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If you will refer to your own paper of January 10th, the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' you will find the condition of the country fairly stated there. They were not looking for representation then; they were looking for an experimental farm; and you will find on page 6 of the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' which is owned and published by the hon. gentleman, I believe, the following:

T. W. Lines brought up the matter of an experimental farm and wanted the government and the sitting members for Edmonton and Strathcona memorialized on the subject. Two years out of ten the mill of the company which he represented had been forced to shut down owing to a lack of grain free from frost. The local wheat millers were occasionally in the same position and had to import wheat. Our potatoes could not be sold in the Kootenay district. These things were due to the lack of information, &c.

So that when you are looking for an experimental farm and when you are looking for representation, your stories do not tally.

Mr. OLIVER. I was speaking of the Vermilion district, on the Peace river, and not of the Edmonton district. The hon. gentleman apparently does not like the facts I have given him and is endeavouring to direct attention somewhere else. We will discuss the question in regard to Edmonton later on if the hon. gentleman wishes, but at the present moment we are discussing the question of Vermilion, and I repeat that there is a roller process flour mill operating with the product of the settlement and supplying the trade of that country, which is not second in appointments or results to any mill in the district of Alberta.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the output?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell you what the output is. The capacity is about fifty barrels a day.

Mr. INGRAM. About seventy-five barrels a year, according to the statement made.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, that's all right. I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the absurdity of the statement made by the hon. member is a sufficient answer to it. The idea that a steam mill would be taken by a company such as the Hudson Bay Company to that remote part of the world, and then only have a capacity of seventy-five barrels a year is sufficiently absurd to stamp at its proper value this or any other statement that the hon. gentleman makes.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman say that the mill that is referred to in this report is the mill that he is referring to now?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say, I am sure. I am not responsible for that report.

Mr. INGRAM. There is the report issued by the government, and the government's statement is the statement I have made. If it is not correct, it is not my fault; it is the fault of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I had occasion to challenge a great many of the statements made by the gentleman who produced that report.

Mr. INGRAM. And you got the worst of it.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact, there was no effort made to establish his statements, either in the House or in the committee.

Mr. BARKER. You answered my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) that it was the Edmonton mill and not the Vermilion one.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I did not intend to answer him in that way. In regard to experimental farms, may I suggest to my hon. friend from Calgary that there have been applications, and very proper applications, before the Department of Agriculture to my knowledge ever since 1896 for the establishment of an experimental farm either in or contiguous to the district which he represents, and I do not think it is any discredit to the district that it should be so. The experimental farm at Indian Head is situated in a farming district, than which there is no better on this continent. And why is it any discredit to the agricultural capabilities of either the Edmonton or the Peace river district that the people there should be anxious for the establishment of an experimental farm? My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is driven to hard straits in support of his contention as to representation when he sees fit to attempt to discredit the agricultural capabilities of a country that is not subject to be discredited by the source from which the attempt comes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Your paper discredited it. I did not.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no discredit in stating facts, and there is nobody who is