

should be excluded from the new provinces is a suggestion that they should be excluded from representation in this parliament. Does he not know that the Territories of the new provinces have been represented in parliament for fifteen or twenty years? Does he not know that the Yukon, still a territory, has representation in this parliament? It does not seem to me to be worthy of the position of the hon. gentleman as a minister of the Crown to endeavour so absolutely to misrepresent a suggestion made by my friend from South York. Why should he do this in view of the words of the Prime Minister of two sessions ago? Did not the Prime Minister at that time point out that the Territories under the government which they enjoy—and the territory of Athabaska would enjoy the same rights, I suppose—does he not remember that the Prime Minister said two years ago that they enjoyed almost every right that a province now enjoys? Does he not remember that on the 21st of February last the Prime Minister said that we were adding very little to the powers of these Territories when we were granting them what he called perfect and complete autonomy? Yet the hon. gentleman is distressed because some one on this side of the House now proposes that a portion of the area to be embraced within the new provinces should be left for the present under a territorial form of government. He talks about campaigning in the west of Canada. The hon. gentleman never seems to be able to get campaigning out of his mind. Every time he gets on his feet it is with the endeavour to put words into the mouth of some gentleman on this side of the House which he never uttered. He never seems to be able to free himself from the idea that he will be campaigning himself within a very short time, and possibly the hon. gentleman may have some misgivings as to how the next campaign may result, or to-day he would not take so much trouble to misrepresent us on this side of the House.

I would think that if my hon. friend from South York proposed to eliminate any portion of the area in the north, it would be better to do as my hon. friend from Hamilton proposed, to make only one province. I have not considered very fully the proposal of the member for South York. I would be more favourably impressed with the suggestion of the member for Hamilton which would result in creating only one province in the south, leaving possibly a new province to be formed in the north. But I am not prepared to say at this moment that I would favour either of these proposals, because I am under the impression that after all a great deal may be said in favour of the idea that you have in the south a territory which is practically settled, and that the territory in the north which it is proposed to add to that is to a very considerable extent of the same character, and may be opened

up by the same mode of settlement. But I rose in the first instance to mention that I do not think it is becoming the position of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to be making these suggestions with regard to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, nor to conduct this debate solely from the standpoint of campaigning in the Northwest. We have some other interests occasionally than those of campaigning to consider, and it is desirable to leave out of mind the campaign speeches to be made on public platforms in elections, and to come down to business principles in dealing with questions of this kind.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I may point out to the minister that for thirty years these Territories now to be erected into provinces have been under territorial government and have had representation in a local legislature. They have had representation here, and if they have not that representation which the hon. gentleman says they ought to have it is because his party did not bring down this Autonomy Bill years ago. They have been in power now eight years before making a move to give that representation here so that it has been in respect to them taxation without representation. But that is altogether apart from the question. If these provinces have not been given representation in this House it is due to the hon. gentlemen opposite. I still say that the northern boundary is better defined by the 55th line than it is by the inclusion of Athabaska. I still maintain that Athabaska has a foundation for a new province and for a present territorial government in the north; and if it is the wish of the House to have only one province where it is now proposed to have two, and to have that line drawn at the 55th line for the Northwest boundary, I am willing to amend my proposal in that direction so as to meet the views of the hon. member for Hamilton.

An hon. MEMBER. It cannot be accepted.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is worthy of consideration, and it can be discussed and voted upon.

Mr. INGRAM. I for one propose supporting the proposition for one province instead of two, and if this amendment is submitted it will put me in a false position if I vote against it. Now I think some attention should be paid to the premier of the Northwest Territories and to the legislature when they themselves advocated one province. I understand that the resolution passed in the Northwest legislature was on the line that they should have provincial autonomy, and that the consensus of opinion was to the effect that one province was ample for the requirements of the Northwest Territories. I feel like sustaining the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories in advocating but one province. I take that view not only from the standpoint of the Northwest Terri-