

few moments ago I referred to the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton. I said I was struck very forcibly with the argument he made, and I regretted very much that this whole matter had been brought into the House cut and dried, decided upon by hon. gentlemen from the west, and that the door was practically closed against any other solution of the question than that which is set forth in these Bills. I confess that I am rather in favour of two provinces than one, but one province might have been created now and another some years hence. We need not talk about provincial autonomy, because we are not giving autonomy to these provinces. We ought to forget that term; we are only giving them partial autonomy; we should call it provincial autonomy limited, because at the best we are limiting the powers of these provinces. With regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South York, I am not sure that I apprehend it fully. I understand that he proposes to make two provinces out of the southern portion of the territory allotted for Saskatchewan and Alberta. I may say that I do not approve of that. Although the hon. gentleman has, I dare say, made the motion in perfect good faith, I say here and now that I am not able to support it, because I think the provinces would be entirely too small. We are over-governed at the present time. Complaint has been made of the small size of the province of Manitoba, and we do not want to create any more small provinces. I would much rather see both of these provinces extended to the northern boundary of Athabaska than to have them cut off at the 55th parallel of latitude. I say this in order to put myself right in case there should be a vote taken on that question.

Mr. CARVELL. I have listened to this discussion with considerable interest. It seems rather to grate upon the nerves of our hon. friends on the Conservative side of the House when an intimation is made from the Minister of the Interior that a process of obstruction has been proposed and is taking place. I am a new member, and do not know what obstruction means; but if the exhibition which we have seen during the last two days is not obstruction, I would like to know what is obstruction. We have been discussing section 1 of this Bill, which simply defines the boundaries of the province of Alberta, and the only valid objection which I have heard is that the eastern boundary of that province should be placed about sixty miles farther east, so that the province of Alberta would take in all the ranching country and leave the agricultural country to the province of Saskatchewan. But it has been shown that that would not make any difference. The only valid reason I have heard advanced in support of that objection has been that there

were about 15,000 brands or marks on the cattle, and it might make some people think they had to register them in both provinces. What hurt would that do?

An hon. MEMBER. It would hurt the animals.

Mr. CARVELL. No, it would not. The fact that the boundary line is there does not take away a man's property in his cattle. So that objection is entirely exploded. But an objection has been raised against including in Alberta the northern portion from what is now called Athabaska. What reason has been given in support of that objection? We are told that we are trying to take away the rights of the opposition; we will not allow them to talk. Then we are told that the people in that part of the country ought not to have representation in a provincial legislature, and in the next breath we are told that they have representation now in the territorial legislature and are entitled to representation in this House. Now, I would like to know what is the trouble with the opposition? I am asking this honestly; I want information on this subject. There must be something rankling in the breasts of the hon. gentlemen on the Conservative side of the House which they are not giving to the House and the country. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) intimated that there was some political reason. If there is, I ask the hon. gentlemen in the name of all that is right and fair, to give us the reason.

Mr. LALOR. Will you vote against the government?

Mr. CARVELL. I will vote with the opposition if they show any valid reason why these people should not have representation. I admire the Minister of the Interior for defending the rights of these people. Because some of them may be half-breeds that is no reason why they should be denied representation in this House or in the provincial legislature of Alberta. There must be some other reason, and it is the duty of the opposition to give it to us. If they do not, if they want to talk for a day or for half a day on something which on its face has no objectionable features, but which ought to be passed, so far as any reasonable man can see, and if they do not want to be charged with obstruction, their duty is to tell us the reason why they are opposing this matter in the manner they are doing.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend who has just spoken is exceedingly hard to please; I am glad he is not a member of the opposition. My hon. friend does not think that moving the boundary line some sixty miles is very important. He does not think that branding about 15,000 head of cattle is of sufficient importance to engage the attention of this House. I am afraid my hon.