

all, but it is no argument against the line being in that particular place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not his argument good, if the fact be as stated by him, that to place the line some sixty miles or thereabouts further east, as suggested by the ex-Minister of the Interior, would practically put the whole ranching country into the western province? That was the point, as I understood it.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not understand the hon. member to say that. I think he said that it would put almost all, or a very large part, of the ranching country into the western province; but he did not pretend, and if he had pretended he would have been incorrect, to say that a line drawn there would include all the ranching country in the western province.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, what I said was: Taking the point where the 8th range intersects the international boundary, following that line north to the Saskatchewan river, and following the Saskatchewan river to range 20 and then going north, would take in all the ranching country shown on the map published by the Department of the Interior. That is what I intended to say.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that my information does not accord with what has been stated by the hon. member for Calgary. My information is that a very important ranching district, known as the Wood mountain district, would still be included in the province of Saskatchewan, if the line he proposes were adopted. Therefore, any disadvantage attaching to the line as it is run would equally attach to the line the hon. gentleman suggests. I would like to point out further in this connection, as it was my duty to state in the House yesterday in regard to another matter, that it is very difficult to define the line between the ranching country and the farming country, for the reason that a country which a few years ago was understood to be solely a ranching country is now being occupied by hundreds, if not thousands, of people for the purpose of grain raising. There are settlements being made for strictly agricultural purposes to-day in the Alberta district, immediately south of the district of Calgary represented by my hon. friend, in localities which, seven years ago, were considered to be strictly ranching country; and the people in those settlements have raised magnificent crops of wheat on that very land, and are depending on wheat raising for their success. So along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the very country he speaks of as exclusively ranching, several towns have started up recently which are dependent for their success on the success of farming in those localities. So that you cannot draw an exact line dividing farming country from ranching country, and my position is main-

tained, that the hon. gentleman's argument is good as against any division, but it is not good as against this particular division between Saskatchewan and Alberta.

With regard to the northern line between the organized and the remaining unorganized territories, for which the 60th parallel is proposed, his argument is the same. He argued for one jurisdiction over the fur-bearing animals all over the country, from the 49th parallel to the Arctic ocean; but he did not show why, if there was to be a division, the 60th parallel was not as good a division as any other that could be made. It is generally agreed, I think, by this House that there is no intention or desire on the part of the people that the whole of that vast western country lying between the western boundary of Manitoba and the Rocky mountains and between the international boundary and the Arctic ocean should be organized under one jurisdiction. If there is to be a division, there is no reason given why this division is not good. We claim that it is a good and fair division. I do not dispute that the dividing line might very well be where my hon. friend has suggested it or at any other place. It might approximately be as well as where it is proposed in this Bill. In the Saskatchewan valley pretty much the same conditions prevail. That is to say, there is no particular place where you can draw a line to make an absolute division between two kinds of country.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the western boundary as being an irregular line, that is to say, the Rocky mountains. Well, we cannot change the Rocky mountains and we cannot change the boundary of British Columbia; we have to accept that as it is. There might possibly be a division between what is called the second prairie steppe and the third or last prairie steppe; that is, the rise of ground that occurs on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway immediately west of Moosejaw, known as the coteau of the Missouri, which crosses the boundary line not far west of Portal and runs northward until it terminates a little south of Battleford. If there is a natural division in that country, it is that line; but it is not either a north or south line, or an east or west line, and it is a line which it is not considered desirable, for many reasons, to adopt.

As to the district of Athabaska, I think what my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has said might very well offset what my hon. friend from Calgary has said. My hon. friend from South York has said, and very truly, that the present importance of that district is very great, and that its prospective importance is very much greater. He has seen fit to designate it, and I think with some degree of justice, as being fit to be the seat of a new province. My hon. friend from Calgary has declared that not only is it not fit to be the seat of a