

by their brands. You can only approach them on horseback. Therefore it is a business entirely different from stock-raising in other parts of Canada. Nearly 100 miles of that stock country east of and next to the Rocky mountains has been turned into an agricultural country during the last three years, and that throws the cattle interests further east, so that they are now confined to a belt about 170 or 200 miles in extent, east of Lethbridge, and from that down to a place called Maple Creek somewhere about 60 miles below the present boundary line. Now there are at the present time some 500,000 head of wild cattle in that district. If that line was to be put 60 miles further east it would take in practically the whole of what is known as the range country in the new province of Alberta. Here I may mention that one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), stated with reference to this boundary question that the stock interests shipped more cattle at Yorkton, out of this stock country, than they did from Alberta, and that therefore Yorkton must be in a stock country also. You might just as well say that the province of Quebec is a stock country because a lot of stock is shipped from the city of Quebec, but the stock comes from the west and is shipped through Quebec. Now I wish to show the House how the proposed boundary line affects the stock business. Suppose that in the new province of Saskatchewan a tax of five cents a head is put on cattle, and that in Alberta a tax of ten cents per head is imposed; hon. gentlemen can see the difficulty stock men would be in. That is an illustration of what would be the result in only one line of business. The owners of these cattle never count them, I suppose they have not been counted for twenty years in some herds, numbering from 5,000 to 15,000 head. As I have said, they are only recognized by their owners by the different brands. If you cut square through the centre of that country where those large herds of wild stock are running, and make a boundary line dividing the stock interests of the two provinces, I think the House will understand that it is very important to the stock interest where that line is put. I hope that when this Bill gets into committee some amendment may be made to it in this direction. I do not see that there could be any objection to it from either side, or from any other province, and it would be of great advantage to the people of the two new provinces. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that this is the only stock country we have in the whole of Canada, indeed it is the only stock country to-day on this continent, where stock runs out the year through. It is a very large business, and will continue to grow for years to come, and I think it would be a pity for this parliament to legislate in any way that would injure

that business. Several hon. members have made light of this boundary question, but we consider it a very serious one in our country. In fact there have been mass meetings in several places protesting against the boundary line running along the fourth meridian.

Now, with reference to the land question. As I said at the beginning, that question has been an issue at all the elections we have had in the Northwest Territories, and I suppose that the result of those elections may be taken as a fair test of the feelings of the people. The test of the last election was that provincial autonomy be granted. The people of the Northwest Territories asked for one province, and I am of the opinion that one province would have been quite sufficient for the present needs of that country and perhaps for all time to come. The people of the Northwest Territories were unanimous, or very nearly so, that one province would be sufficient. That was a question that was left undecided in Mr. Haultain's draft Bill, but one question that they were decided upon was that they should themselves handle the lands and minerals in that country. I think there is no question as to what the decision of the people of the Northwest Territories was on that point. Mr. Haultain went to the country in 1902; that question was discussed on every platform, and after the elections were over and the returns were counted, while a few dissented from Mr. Haultain's opinions in regard to the general principles of administration, on the principle of provincial autonomy there was not one dissenting voice at the first meeting of the assembly. I think that is one of the best indications of the way the people in the Northwest Territories feel on this question. Hon. members have read letters from people in the Northwest Territories and, as I stated a moment ago, one hon. member read a letter from a gentleman in Alberta saying that the people desired that the Dominion government should retain control of their lands. You can only compare that with what occurred in 1902 in the elections. One of the reasons why we are so much in favour of retaining our own lands in the Northwest Territories is this: We have laboured from the early days under the disadvantage of railway and other corporations owning a great deal of the land. It makes no difference what government is responsible for it, the fact exists, and we have to deal with it as we find it. It must be recognized that it is a hardship to the people in that country to be at the trouble and expense of improving land that other people may derive the benefit from their efforts. Every dollar that we have expended in the improvement of our land has been expended to improve the land of railway and private corporations, and we have always looked forward to the time when this government would deal in some way with these corporations, and put the