

Mr. LALOR. You say you cannot understand why they were not there. Were they invited to be there? I would like you to answer that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether they were invited to be there or not; I know they were not there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. We did not meet although they certainly had the privilege of being there if they wanted to be.

Mr. LALOR. In what way did the hon. minister give them that privilege?

Mr. OLIVER. They were invited to the meeting we had and the business of that meeting was not concluded.

Mr. TURRIFF. This meeting was called by Mr. Haultain. I was present at it. The bulk of the discussion was over the boundary line between the two provinces and we could not agree upon that. I remember distinctly that matter of the boundaries of the divisions was discussed, but why it was not continued further or why there were not any further meetings about it I do not know. But, we met there at the call of Mr. Haultain who said that the Prime Minister had asked him to give his views and to give information in reference to the dividing line and also in reference to the number of the constituencies for the two provinces.

Mr. LAKE. Is the hon. gentleman sure it was not as to the number of the constituencies of the two provinces? I think an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House stated last night that that was the question at issue.

Mr. TURRIFF.* No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, if that is the recollection of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) I think we came pretty close to the question of delimiting the boundaries, if there was a question discussed as to the number of constituencies.

Mr. LAKE. I did not say that of my own knowledge; I merely said that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) stated that last night.

Mr. OLIVER. The conference was certainly held for the purpose of discussing this question of the delimitation of the constituencies. The first preliminary which it was necessary to decide was what should be the boundary between the two provinces. The next point was to decide how many constituencies there should be, and certainly the question of the boundary between the provinces was discussed. There is no denial of that. There is no denial that the other question as to the future of the new provinces was discussed, as stated by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) last night. The discussion was not confined to the delimitation of the provinces. As stated by my

hon. friend here there was also a question discussed as to the number of the constituencies. In the name of common sense how can we discuss the boundaries of the constituencies until we had decided the boundaries between the provinces and considered how many constituencies there should be?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely that must be evident. But, the point is that the conference was held for that purpose or else there was no purpose in holding it. If it is decided that there was a conference between the two sides of the House, there was no attempt to sidetrack hon. gentlemen opposite or to shirk giving them any information, but on the contrary every effort was made to have a unanimous presentation of the case to the House, and as far as we are concerned if it was not so put before the House the fault is not ours but the fault is that of hon. gentlemen opposite who did not see fit to take part in the discussion. If that matter is disposed of—

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is not satisfactorily disposed of.

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my hon. friend, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would put it to my hon. friend again so that he will see the difficulty. What was the principle that the right hon. leader of the government said he had in the back of his head? The idea was that representatives of the two sides of this House would come together. That is the only way in which a conference takes place between the government and opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. This was a sort of social meeting.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman deny that such a meeting took place?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. What right has he to trespass, anyway?

Mr. FOSTER. If such a meeting took place it was a social meeting between gentlemen from the Northwest.

Mr. OLIVER. Does he assert that it was a social meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope it was not a dis-social meeting? I do not say that there was anything round the table or anything on the board. Or, shall I say that it was an amicable meeting? In his present temper probably the word 'amicable' grates upon the hon. minister just like drawing the breath of the southern pine across a Northwest blizzard. But an amicable meeting, we will say, took place between gentlemen from the Northwest Territories, a sort of family