

tion of the Territories into one province, in which case the eastern boundary would have been Manitoba and the western British Columbia.

Mr. MONK. Is there not something in the communication of Mr. Haultain referring to a suitable division line between the two provinces, in case it is decided to establish two provinces? Or did the views of the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories agree with the line adopted?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has reference to a letter written by Mr. Haultain in which he speaks of a division which, in his judgment, would be more convenient than this one. It would run about seventy miles east of the fourth meridian. I think he favoured that division on the ground that the area adapted to ranching would be all in Alberta and the wheat-growing lands in Saskatchewan, so far as the southern country is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) speaking on the 24th of March stated that he had suggested in his discussions—I suppose, with his colleagues—that the dividing line between the two new provinces should be about sixty miles further east than that provided for by the Bill. He said also that he had not heard the reasons which led the government to a different conclusion. As we may assume that his very great knowledge of the country derived from his long experience as Minister of the Interior, should entitle his opinion to some weight, might I ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or whoever has this particular matter in charge, to state the reason which led the government, in this particular instance, to disregard the opinion of the ex-Minister of the Interior?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There have been several suggestions made with regard to this boundary, and I think it is difficult to say that one is highly preferable to another. Some hon. members, and, I believe, Mr. Haultain, were of the opinion—an opinion which has been expressed on the floor of this House by some hon. members from the Northwest Territories—that the boundary line should be about seventy miles east of the fourth meridian. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) was of opinion that the boundary should be one or two townships further east. I do not know that that hon. gentleman had any particular reason for wishing it one way or the other, he was not much concerned whether it was the fourth meridian or a little eastward of that. The great bone of contention was the boundary which was suggested by Mr. Haultain, and, I think, by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron). The argument was that if the boundary were fixed seventy miles eastward of the fourth meridian, all the ranching country would be in Alberta.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

But for my part, I could not, on inquiry, satisfy myself that this was the case. I think that if the boundary were so fixed there would be ranching lands both in Saskatchewan and Alberta. I think the main reason which led to the adoption of the fourth meridian as the boundary was that it would be a line much more easily identified. So far as I can see, as between the line suggested by my hon. friend from Brandon, (Mr. Sifton) and the fourth meridian line there would not be much difference. We chose the meridian because it is far easier to identify, as I imagine, and because, as I understand, the preponderance of opinion amongst members from the Northwest Territories was in favour of that line.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In discussing the measure on the second reading, I pointed out that the division of the country at the fourth meridian was unpopular in the cattle country. I pointed out that a public meeting had been called at Medicine Hat to consider the matter. The meeting was called by the mayor and was irrespective of politics. Certain resolutions were passed which I have read to the House on two occasions. The fourth resolution was as follows:

That the placing of the dividing line at the 4th meridian is a great hardship to the ranching industry, in that the laws governing a province consisting of a farming country will conflict with the laws required in a ranching country.

Now, I hold that the line should be further east, as proposed by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), for the reason that if the line were drawn where he suggests, or a very little further east, practically all the ranching country would be included in the western province. That statement has been denied. It is possible for a man to rise in this House and make any statement and give certain facts in support of it. But, if he does not give all the facts, the statement is apt to lead to a wrong conclusion. We were told by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turrieff)—I think it was that hon. gentleman—that the ranching country extended right down to Manitoba. If he will look, or if hon. gentlemen who are interested in the question, would look, at a map published by the Department of the Interior a few years ago, they will find the ranching country outlined. If the boundary line were moved east say as far as the eighth range west of the third meridian, it would practically take in all the ranching country. If the following of the line would make a noticeable difference in the area of the two provinces that could be easily avoided by following that line north to the South Saskatchewan river and along the South Saskatchewan west to range 20, and then north as originally proposed. If that were done the difficulty of dividing the ranching country in two would be practically overcome, if the map issued by the Department of the Interior, to which I have reference, is cor-