

forty miles of the Rocky Mountains, it is close to the western side and at the southern end, and if there is any reason in having a central location for the capital, whatever other claims Calgary may have, it has certainly none of these. Edmonton is fairly centrally situated as between the easterly and westerly sides of the province, and as between the northerly and southerly ends, much more favourably situated than Calgary or any other business centre in the new province. That being the case, and it being a prospective railway centre, being already the centre of a very large population, as has been shown during the debate on the distribution, it seems to me that the fact that it is at the terminus of a branch line is no evidence against its suitability to be the capital, but is rather another evidence in its favour. Edmonton is located at a distance of 200 miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, in a rich country tributary to it, and if, with 100 miles of railway, that Edmonton country is already equal in population, or nearly equal, to the population of the Calgary country with 900 miles of railway, it is fair to suppose that Edmonton with 900 miles of railway will be immeasurably ahead of Calgary in population, as Edmonton will have approximately 900 miles of railway tributary to it within a short time. I think it would be strange if the government of this country should not take all these facts into consideration in locating the capital of the province. It would certainly be very improper not to take into consideration the future prospects as well as the geographical location.\* There has nothing been said or shown, or can be said or shown, against the good judgment of the government in placing the capital at Edmonton. It has been necessary for the government to choose some point in the new province for a capital, and after they have done that, the matter passes out of their hands, and the new province will settle the question of a permanent capital.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The charge of the Minister of Interior that the proceedings on this question have been delayed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House is about as fair as most of the statements that he makes in this House. This question I suppose has been discussed for about twenty minutes. The question of a capital has always been a burning question in every province of this Dominion. I would like the hon. minister to point out where any reason has been given in this House since the present session was called why Edmonton should be selected as a provisional capital except that it was the centre of the country. Let us follow out that argument. Where would it land us in the province of Ontario? Up above White Fish Point. Where would you be in the province of Quebec, or the province of Manitoba, or the province of British Columbia? Why then should an

Mr. OLIVER.

exception be made in this case, and why should you move the capital away from the centre of population and of trade, Calgary being the accessible centre to-day? The hon. gentleman speaks of railway construction that is to be. If Edmonton becomes the great railway centre that the hon. gentleman anticipates, then that matter is in the hands of the local legislature and they can place it wherever they think the centre is. But I want to refer to his argument with regard to railway construction. If any person will look at the map at the line of the Canadian Northern and where the Grand Trunk Pacific is looking for a line, he will find that it will open just as much country in the south as it will in the north. I submit that this capital should not be chosen on the ground of expectation and prophesy. I do not think my hon. friend will pretend that there is a greater population in the northern part of that province than in the southern part. I would ask him to look at this map published by the Department of the Interior, showing the lands surveyed up to the 1st of January, 1905, and he will find there that Calgary is in the centre of a very large section of surveyed land, while Edmonton is practically on the northern limit. When you go thirty or forty miles west of Edmonton and fifty or sixty-five miles north, there are no more townships surveyed, which have been printed. We have the evidence produced from his own department showing where the settlement in that country is to-day. Now on the question of population, Waghorn's Guide for February gives the population of Calgary at 9,175 and the population of Edmonton at 5,400. Does the hon. gentleman contend that there are more people in the city of Edmonton to-day than there are in Calgary? Look at the vote that was cast last November as another evidence.

Mr. OLIVER. I contend that there are many more people in Edmonton than Waghorn's Guide says there are.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are there any more in Calgary?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Take the vote that was cast last November, and multiply that vote by four or five, and see how that will work out. If you multiply it by five there is a population in the city of Calgary of 13,410 and in the city of Edmonton of 8,445.

Mr. OLIVER. How many voters does the hon. gentleman figure as being in the city of Calgary?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I figure out on the list in the city of Calgary that there were 2,682.

Mr. OLIVER. How many were cast?