

to be one of the party heelers of our friends on the other side, in the by-elections which did not concern him or the Territories and therefore we take the liberty of suggesting that his word in this matter is not to be considered as that of the premier of the Territories but as that of a partisan of our friends on the other side.

Mr. AMES. Let us understand this clearly. The legislature are not to blame because Mr. Haultain did not call them together. Premier Haultain is particeps criminis in this because he did not protest. The Minister of the Interior announces that if he had protested it would have made no difference. It seems to me that this is very hard on Premier Haultain, to hold him criminally responsible for something he could not possibly help. Would the minister explain how that can be?

Mr. OLIVER. It takes five of the hon. member's constituents to equal one of the members for Argenteuil; he is excused. The premier of the Territories is responsible to the people of the Territories, to the legislature of the Territories as premier. He acts by and through and with his legislature and until he does call his legislature together and give that legislature an opportunity to voice its opinions on that question he is speaking as an individual and not as premier. Does my hon. friend understand that?

Mr. AMES. I understand what you mean, yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The somewhat remarkable speech to which we have just listened, from the Minister of the Interior, has concluded with a rather undignified attack on a gentleman who is not here to protect himself. That is quite in keeping with some of the characteristics of the hon. Minister of the Interior. As far as Mr. Haultain is concerned, he deserves no such language as has been applied to him by the Minister of the Interior. He was summoned here as Prime Minister of the Territories without any special session of the legislature being held, and as Prime Minister of the Territories he placed himself, as far as I know, at the service of this government and gave them every possible assistance by the furnishing of information for the purpose of preparing this Bill. He did that in good faith and I know that, so far as I am concerned, I never had any conversation with him while the proceedings were going on; he regarded them as absolutely confidential and placed himself absolutely at the disposal of this government. Further than that he brought the best man he could from the Territories, a gentleman who has been at the service of this government during the last four or five months, and in every possible way he has done what he could to facilitate the enactment of this Bill along what he regarded

as right and proper lines; and because forsooth he finds himself at liberty to address two or three audiences of his fellow countrymen—and I suppose he has as good a right to be heard in those elections as the minister himself—he is to be characterized by this gentlemanly Minister of the Interior as a party heeler. Well, I do not know that the language is worth noticing, but I venture to think that the Minister of the Interior does not add anything to the respect in which he is held by this House to or the dignity of the administration when he indulges in such a tirade.

If his information as to the northern portions of the province of Alberta is not more accurate than his knowledge of the Redistribution Bill of 1903, we had better hand this Bill at once to a commission of judges and get some information that is really of value. He told us about the county of Argenteuil and the constituency of Maisonneuve. Does he not know the two principles that were laid down by his leader when he introduced that Bill into this House? One was that municipal and country boundaries must be observed; and does he not know that on account of that principle, imposed upon the committee of which I was a member, these very discrepancies to which he has referred are entirely due except so far as they are due to another principle enunciated by his leader and mentioned again to-day, namely, that rural constituencies should receive a larger voting power to the elector than city constituencies. These two principles stated by his leader on the floor of this House many times during the debate of 1903, acquiesced in by his own vote, are responsible for these very differences to which he has called attention. Now he knows well enough that no such principles apply to the province of Alberta, because there are no municipal and county boundaries there, so far as I am aware. He says that the leader of the opposition, when the county of Richmond was in question in 1903, did not raise his voice. Is he quite sure of that? Is he stating that as a fact? Does he persevere in that statement?

Mr. OLIVER. I would say that the leader of the opposition did not raise his voice loud enough for me to hear it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is probable, because the hon. gentleman was not in attendance in the House; in accordance with his usual practice he was probably waiting outside for the bell to ring before he came in to vote on something of which he knew nothing. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did make a motion before the committee, and referred to it again in the House and pressed it upon the attention of the House, with regard to the county of Richmond, the only instance to which he has called attention. I merely point that out to show how extremely inaccurate the