

to the country at large, but they have invested him with what we may call a geographical ministerial responsibility, and they have declared above board, honestly, we suppose, earnestly, we know, that the new doctrine has been embodied in the government of this country, that a minister is not only responsible to the whole country, but he is especially responsible to the geographical division which he is more intimately connected with. Now, Sir, if that were good for a Fisher, why is it not good for a Sifton? If that were good enough when you wanted some machinery and engineering in order to carry out a piece of vile patronage, why is it not a thousand times better when the rights of 500,000 free people in the great and growing Northwest are in question? Good, when you want to suppress a Dundonald, but bad, when you want to use it as the means for keeping these 500,000 people from getting their wishes embodied in parliamentary form. The pretense of absolute and complete autonomy has been completely stripped off from the right hon. gentleman. These pretenses were lovely and beautiful when the speech was being delivered, and all the men on that side of the House said 'amen' and rent the air with their plaudits. What do they think now, that these pretenses are stripped off? To-day the Northwest has no representative in the cabinet. To-day I cannot say that the Northwest has any friend in the cabinet. You are not legislating here for the province of Nova Scotia, you are not legislating here for the province of Prince Edward Island, you are not legislating here for the province of New Brunswick, of Quebec, of Ontario or of British Columbia. Only in a general way are you legislating for these provinces, and in this particular Bill that general way is a very small way indeed. Thus we, the representative of these other provinces, are legislating for a great people now and an immensely greater people hereafter, laying down a hard granite mould, outside of which they cannot step or run in their great growing life for all the years that are to come. Yet these gentlemen who stood up in 1896 to demand provincial rights, who stood up in 1896 in strong demand that the people in the country for which that legislation was demanded were the people whose wishes and will were to be found out—these people to-day rush into legislation without consulting the accredited representative of the Northwest, who, I do not think, have a single friend in the cabinet. Why should I think they have not a single friend in the cabinet? Who is a friend? The hon. Minister of the Interior had his convictions. He made them known. The right hon. First Minister knew them. But there were other men who said they had convictions. The hon. minister who sits alongside my right hon. friend, the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), said in 1896 that he had

convictions. They were as strong as those that were held by the Minister of the Interior. That hon. minister has been in the cabinet. He has seen his brother minister who had convictions leave it for these convictions. He himself has subscribed to the clause which has made it necessary for his brother minister, the Minister of the Interior, to leave the cabinet. Can we count upon the hon. Postmaster General as a friend of the Northwest Territories? We have got to say this, that the hon. Postmaster General agreed with the legislation, helped to frame it, stands by it, let his convictions of the past be what they may have been. We know the hon. Postmaster General to be a man who has ideals when they are pleasant, who has ideals, and high ones, when he is aiming for power, but who forgets to practise them when once he gets into power. What have we to-day? My right hon. friend has declared before this House that he does not propose to take into consideration at present the nomination of a minister of the Northwest Territories. How long are we going to sit in this parliament without having a minister for the Northwest Territories, without having the cabinet filled up? The hon. Postmaster General had ideals at one time. One ideal was that you should not keep offices dangling before the minds and eyes of representatives for fear you might influence them corruptly. What a splendid thing to keep dangling to-day is the ministership for the Northwest Territories? How effectively my right hon. friend might use it, and he knows how to use such things. He used them with Mr. Langelier, and all the world knows it. He has been using them ever since, and all Canada knows it. How nice it is to see him now holding this Ministership of the Interior up before the gaze of all the members from the Northwest, as much as to say—and it is not necessary for the right hon. First Minister to say it in words—behold the beautiful thing! See the patronage and power that are attached to it! Look at the splendour which crowns it! It is for one of you, which one I do not say; but it is certainly not going to the chap who does not stand by me. Yet the hon. Postmaster General, who made a long crusade against that kind of thing at a period when he had ideals, helps to forward the same gross and material conception as an aid to twentieth century statesmanship.

Where is the Minister of Finance? He too was a brother of the Minister of the Interior in these good old days when they were straining for power and when it was popular to advocate provincial rights. Can any stronger statements be made by anybody than were made by the Minister of Finance? Is that the reason why the Bill should have been brought down before the Minister of Finance got here? Any way the Bill is down and the education clause is in it. Is the Minister of Finance a friend