

our boundaries. This was necessary for various reasons.

On school districts and local improvement districts were losing money through the exemption of land from taxation. This was through no fault of ours and the people of Canada at large should pay for the mistakes of the Parliament of Canada. We should have compensation. We should be in position to claim from the people of Canada money compensation for the loss we sustain because of the exemptions; and before we were in a position to make this claim for compensation we ought to know exactly what our boundaries were. This, therefore, was another step to be taken in the matter.

But that raised yet another question, viz., whether their boundaries should really extend to the Arctic circle. He

very much doubted the wisdom of that. They were asking a good deal from the Dominion Government when they asked as much as that. He thought they were asking for something they were not likely to get. He did not think any government in Canada would ever grant it. It was a question whether it would be of any utility if we did get it. He questioned if that very far northern country would ever become inhabited; but if it did and the inhabitants should desire to be added to the new province there was machinery in the British North America Act by which that addition could be made, but he did not believe that the northern boundary of the new province should extend to the North Pole. He thought they should take the 60th parallel of latitude for the northern boundary. That was the northern boundary of British Columbia. The new province would therefore be bounded by the 60th parallel on the north, by Manitoba on the east and British Columbia on the west. This province, south of the 60th parallel, would contain an area somewhere in the neighborhood of 280,000 square miles, or an area half as great as that of all the other provinces put together. Would we not be asking the Dominion a great deal—would we not be asking them too much—when we asked to be made into a province half as large as the rest of the Dominion? He was sure they did not wish to ask for anything unreasonable. This matter must be dealt with not only from a Territorial but from a Canadian point of view. How would it strike the other provinces?—how would it strike for instance the province of Ontario to have a province more than twice as large as itself? There was danger to his mind in confederation—a danger that strong provinces or states might be a menace to confederation itself. He thought the strength of a confederation was in the weakness of its units. He thought the strength of its units was the weakness of confederation. He remembered when the United States constitution was subject to considerable strain by reason of sectional feeling of the east against the west. It was more difficult to give effect to that feeling when the States were relatively small than when they were relatively large. Now he should be sorry to be understood as giving expression to the idea that we needed to increase the number of local governments in this country. One local government would serve our needs for years to come yet. It would be ridiculous to give 100,000 or 200,000 people a double set of legislative machinery. But when we asked the Dominion Government to vest us with more powers, we should ask ourselves the question "What is to be our ultimate status?" If, continued Dr. Patrick, "we should decide on an ultimate division into two provinces—and my own opinion is that an ultimate division into two provinces is a desirable thing—if we should decide on two provinces, then there is no reason why we should not have the two provinces defined as two Territories and united together for the purposes of government under one government." We had, he said, had the name of the North-West Territories of Canada now for some twenty-five years. If we were to be one province let us be established now as one Territory, with one name. If we were to have two provinces then let there be two Territories with distinctive names but one government. He might remind them that Upper and Lower Canada from 1841 to 1867 were united. There were obstacles to the union of those provinces which did not exist in this country. There were differences of race and creed that prevented for some years a harmonious union, but if they could get along for twenty-six or twenty-seven years, surely we in the west could get along for fifteen or twenty years. But he thought they ought not only to look ahead for 15 or 20 years, they should look farther than that. This country was capable of supporting a population of millions. Its territory was larger than Norway, Sweden and Finland and surely it was capable of supporting a larger population than those countries. Not only was our country larger, but our climate was not so inhospitable, the country was not so mountainous, there was room for a much larger agricultural population; and the population of Norway, Sweden and Finland was about seven millions. They must look forward to the time when these Territories would have five millions, or even ten millions of people occupying it. The question arose, What would be the state of things then? That was the point of view from which this matter must be looked at by the Government and the Parliament and the people of Canada; and it was our duty to look at it as Canadians as well as residents of the Territories. He did not believe that at the present time, nor for years yet, nor for many years yet, not until the population reached 500,000 or even more, that we should ask to be separated. For years at least the government should be vested in one legislature—as long perhaps as Lower and Upper Canada stayed together, we might remain as a united province.

Another reason that made him take this view of the question was that he believed when provincial status is established the question of a portion of the Territories being hitched on to a neighboring province would arise. He did not think Manitobans would care to see a large predominating province alongside of them. He did not think that was likely to suit their views. He thought that if we tried to have one very large province established under one government it would excite sufficient jealousy to make the people of the province of Manitoba ask for an extension of their boundaries. If it were clear to him that our boundaries would not be interfered with if he were assured that no interference would be attempted with a view to hitch any section of the eastern portion of the Territories on to Manitoba—he quite admitted that then from the local point of view a large area under one government would be the best. If a large area could be established as one province, and it could be left to the people themselves when the population grew large enough to seek for division—for the province to seek division of itself—that would put a different aspect on the matter; but what he feared was that if we sought to have too large a territory established as one province, it would lead to a division of the whole which would be anything but satisfactory to the inhabitants of the eastern portion of the Territories. For that and for many other reasons he was inclined to hold that we should look at this question fairly, and ask

ourselves whether 280,000 square miles, which would be the area of each province if we were divided, was too small an area for a province in this year to come. He would like to repeat that he was no advocate for any unnecessary machinery of local government or any other governmental machinery, but he thought they should look at this question not from the point of view of the present, or of the immediate future, or of the comparatively near future, but from the point of view of even the far distant future. (Applause.)

The motion to go into supply was then agreed to. Mr. Speaker left the chair. The House resolved into committee. Mr. Baulain moved that the committee rise and report, progress and ask leave to sit again, and the House adjourned at midnight.