

when he did not take that plain course which it was his duty to do, I say that, so far as he is concerned, the case is against the contention of my hon. friend that any injustice has been done. Hon. gentlemen opposite can take either horn of the dilemma they please. Either Mr. Haultain did not do his duty, or there has been a fair division. They must accept either one position or the other. There is a responsibility in this matter outside of this House. We admit our share of that responsibility, but we do not admit a responsibility which properly rests upon the shoulders of the premier of the Territories. And it is not the privilege of hon. members to cry out injustice, to claim to be fighting the battle of the people of the Territories, when they are simply agitating in the interests of their own political party, as is evidenced by the demands of the leader of the opposition and his lieutenant to-day—until they clear themselves and their party from the imputation of their having been guilty of dereliction of duty as regards the action of the Territorial legislature.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman's argument to be this, that in case there is guilt on the part of the government in bringing in an unfair schedule, that guilt does not rest upon their shoulders, but upon the shoulders of Mr. Haultain, because he did not insist upon the schedule being different?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether my hon. friend is a member of the legal profession or not. I am not; but I think I have some little knowledge of the rules of law; and I think my hon. friend will admit that, under the existing circumstances, if a crime has been committed, our mutual friend, the premier of the Territories, has been certainly an accessory after the fact, if not before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. He had it in his power to bring into this discussion the very people of the Territories, the very constituencies affected. He has not seen fit to do so; and I submit that if he has not done so, it is not because he had no desire to embarrass this government, it is not because he would not go out of his way to embarrass it, if he thought he had a case. We have had ample evidence of that this last few weeks. And so my hon. friends, when they assume to create a grievance amongst the people of the district of Alberta, would do well to find the ground on which they are standing before they depend upon it too much. They have insinuated and suggested that this distribution is for the purpose of giving a preponderance of representation to that end of the province which is more in accord with the Liberal party than with them. They probably do not know that in the southern end of the province there is a fair proportion of local constituencies represented by Liberals and that as far as that

Mr. OLIVER.

part of it is concerned, a Liberal vote in the south end is as good as one in the north end, and when they argue that we are trying to take votes from the south because they are Conservative votes and give them to the north because they are Liberal votes they simply are arguing against what is the plain fact.

Mr. BARKER. You are the only one who has argued on that.

Mr. OLIVER. Then if the hon. members are not arguing on that point in the name of common sense, what have they kept us here the last three days for? There is no ground of complaint as between constituency and constituency, the only complaint that has ever been suggested is as between north and south on the part of the south as against the north as these gentlemen are championing it. If they have any reason for the championship which they have been putting forward I should say it is up to them to give their consent to a proposal which after three days discussion, they have failed to show in any particular is unfair and permit the business of the House and country to proceed.

Mr. AMES. With reference to the premier of the Northwest Territories, does the minister intimate that if the premier had protested against this schedule or should now protest against it, or should go on record in any way as considering this schedule unfair, the government would take that into consideration and would change the schedule in any way?

Mr. OLIVER. I should say certainly not.

Mr. AMES. Then how could he be particeps criminis.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend seeks to get away from the point. It is not a question of the premier of the Territories but of the legislature of the Territories. We are not questioning the action or the proposed action of the hon. the premier; we have had evidence within the past two or three weeks of his partisanship, of his readiness to prostitute his premiership to the interests of hon. gentlemen on the other side. We do not suggest that his personal view is any better than that of any other individual in the Northwest Territories, but we do suggest that as premier of the Territories it is his right, it is within his power, it is his bounden duty, if an injustice is being done to the people of those Territories by this Bill, to call the legislature and let the voice of the legislature be heard. Talk from the premier of the Territories is of no account; it is votes that count in the Territories, as it is votes that count here. Let him speak through his legislature and I will guarantee he will be heard and the voice of the legislature will be heard as well, but so far our friend the premier of the Northwest Territories has been content