

Mr. OLIVER. They will get representation when the provinces are organized, if they are allowed to be organized under these Bills.

Mr. BARKER. Are not the present Territories represented here?

Mr. OLIVER. We think they are.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then, I am not depriving them of representation.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to repeat that the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to exclude this district of Athabaska from the proposed provinces is an attempt to exclude that district from the representation in this parliament which it will necessarily have as a part of the proposed province of Alberta. It is also a declaration that the district of Athabaska, which, as I have already pointed out to the House, contributes a very considerable amount of the general trade of this country, is not entitled to representation, is not entitled to that consideration which a civilized community is considered to be entitled to, and which must be extended to it if the country is to develop and progress.

Now, perhaps it is not, of very great interest to hon. gentlemen on the other side whether the two or three hundred white people who live in that district to-day secure their rights or not and whether they are to be taxed without representation or not. Perhaps it makes very little difference to them whether the few thousands of half-breeds, 'mere' half-breeds who are in that country are to be taxed without representation or not. But I do submit that it makes a great deal of difference to this country whether that district of Athabaska,—whether these great valleys watered by the Athabaska and Peace rivers—are developed for settlement and trade, to furnish a market to the manufacturers and business houses of this eastern country. I say it makes a very great deal of difference whether a policy is pursued which will bring about that end or whether that country is to be excluded from the beneficial operation of provincial and Dominion government, because it has only a few white people and half-breeds at the present time. The hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has seen fit to put on record the views we have heard expressed in this House all day yesterday and to-day on the part of the opposition. And, for the purpose of campaigning in the west, I can only wish that they should stand up and unanimously vote for this proposition. We, on this side, cannot ask anything better—that is, if we are to set ourselves in opposition to one another in these matters, as, I am sorry to see, there is a tendency to do. But it is not our desire on this side that that should be the case. Still, if hon. gentlemen opposite are desirous of dividing the House on this amendment and placing

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

before the people of this country their views that the area of country containing two great valleys of untold richness of agricultural land, minerals and timber is not worthy of representation in the provincial legislature, or in the Dominion parliament, but that the principle of taxation without representation is to be forced upon that country, because forsooth, it has only, at the present time, a few half-breeds and a few whites. Certainly, it is the privilege of hon. gentlemen opposite to put themselves on record in that way. But, on this side of the House the policy is in favour of the development of that country by railroad construction and the opening of the 400 miles of country that lies northwest from Edmonton to the foot of the Rocky mountains, a development that will bring into commercial use the whole of the navigable waters of the Peace river. Those who believe in that policy favour giving that country representation. We want to see it represented in the local House, we want to see it represented in the Dominion House; we want representation when there is taxation. We want to see that country given development and progress, not for its own sake alone, but for the sake of the whole country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not suppose that a committee of this House ever listened to a more extraordinary tirade from a minister of the Crown than that we have just heard. I can only repeat what I said the other night, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) does not seem to have yet got over the idea that he is a back-bencher. He talks as a back-bencher, and not as a minister of the Crown, whenever he gets on his feet to address this committee. That is my deliberate judgment after having heard him two or three times. He says that my hon. friend from East York is trying to deprive the people of representation. Does not he remember that he himself, repeatedly, and not later than three or four weeks ago, said that the people of the Northwest did not want provincial autonomy at all. Yet now his soul is exercised with much indignation because a particular district is proposed to be excluded by the hon. member for South York. A minister of the Crown ought to have a better memory than that.

It may do well enough for my hon. friend before he assumes the dignity of office but a minister of the Crown should really recollect what he himself said only a few weeks ago. Was he endeavouring to withhold from the people of the west all those rights that he has been speaking about for the last ten minutes, when he was opposing provincial autonomy? Does the hon. gentleman say that residing in the territories must necessarily exclude you from representation in parliament? He says that a suggestion that a portion of these territories