

rect. And I submit that that map was prepared and circulated before there was any question as to any division of the territory. For, until recently it has been the general impression in that country that the whole area would be made one province. And that has been the view expressed by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he held meetings in that country last fall. It was also the desire of the First Minister of the Territories. For my part I can see no reason why there should be two provinces. I do not know what objection may be raised in the east against creating the Territories into one province, but, so far as the people of the west are concerned, they would prefer that there should be only one province. I feel sure that I can speak for the constituency I have the honour to represent on that point. The reasons are plain. It would avoid the duplication of public officials and public buildings, thus effecting a saving to the new provinces, and it would be less expensive to the Dominion administration as well. But, Sir, if the Territories must be divided into two provinces then I say there are several objections to the line drawn at the fourth meridian. I find an article published in the 'Farm and Ranch Review' about six weeks ago, where these objections are clearly set out. It says:

Little doubt is now entertained that a Bill will shortly be brought before parliament conferring on the organized Northwest Territories the status of full fledged provinces. We use the plural, as it also seems to be pretty well decided that there are to be two provinces, divided by a line running north and south. Precisely where that line will be located is not, however, at the present time quite determined. Some say it will intersect Walsh district, others that it will run as far east as Swift Current. Any one even tolerably acquainted with the western conditions, would harbour very little doubt as to where that line should be located. The point is an important one, but not nearly so important as many others involved in the provincial negotiations, and it gives the western man a most uncomfortable feeling to sit down and realize that the future destinies of the new provinces are to a very large extent to be decided by a body of men who are capable of hesitating whether to divide the country at Walsh or at Swift Current.

Swift Current would bring the line about where the member for Brandon states it will be. The article goes on to say:

The boundary between the two provinces should be fixed solely with reference to economical and effective administration. Neither the geographical nor the political phase of the question should be considered. The boundary at Walsh would leave a slice of the winter wheat and ranching country in the easterly province, while the great bulk of the semi-arid area would be embraced in the westerly province. This would be a most unfortunate state of affairs. . . . The present proposal to put a slice of the semi-arid country into the eastern province would from a geographical standpoint be an excellent course, practically it would be most objectionable and unpopular.

. . . The difficulties in the way of successful administration of stock brands if the territories were divided at the fourth meridian, would in themselves be sufficient to condemn such a proposal. Two provinces mean two brand systems. The complications that would arise were the division line to run through Walsh, the very heart and centre of the eastern ranching country, with cattle and horses bearing identical or conflicting brands ranging on either side of an imaginary boundary line would be endless and serious. If a vote were taken on the subject in the area involved, it would be found that the ranchers are unanimous in their desire to remain attached to the ranching country to the west. If, however, it is felt that a division at Swift Current leaves too small an area in the easterly province, this objection can be easily overcome by running the line west along the southerly boundary of Saskatchewan and taking in a sufficiently large area of the westerly portion of that district to compensate for the part of Assiniboia lying between Walsh and Swift Current.

To my mind that article sets out the objections clearly. It may appear a small matter to an eastern man to split up the ranching country, but if this map which is supposed to give the area is correct, then in leaving a very small amount of that ranching country in the eastern province the result will be that it will have such a small representation in the local House that its demands will not receive the consideration to which they are entitled. It is apparent that one province may pass a law making a brand a badge of ownership of cattle and horses, and another province may not require any brand at all. One province may enact that cattle and horses not branded with a registered brand may be sold irrespective of the owner. You will have these large herds along that dividing line, and you break that great ranching country into two parts and destroy the range. One province might adopt a free open range while another might make some restrictions. One province may impose a tax on cattle running on the range and another will not. It is going to lead to all sorts of confusion at the boundary. Another objection to the line as proposed is that it will leave a very small proportion of the lands capable of irrigation in the eastern province. I understand that under the proposed Bill, power is going to be retained by the Dominion parliament over the question of irrigation, though I understood from the remarks of the member for Brandon that that would only be for a short time until certain international difficulties had disappeared, and then irrigation would be handed back to the respective provinces. Before this discussion closes I intend to move an amendment specifying that this line shall go from the 8th range north to the south of the Saskatchewan river, then west along the river against stream to range twenty and follow that range north. We have heard that there is a larger population in