

HAULTAIN'S SPEECH

In Closing the Provincial Autonomy Debate in the Assembly.

A QUESTION OF MANDATES.

The Premier Analyzes the Position of the Opposition on Autonomy—Dr. Patrick's Absurd Bill of Rights like a Hudson's Bay Railway Would Solve Many Difficulties—The Division.

THURSDAY, APRIL 10.
The speaker took the chair at 2.30 p.m. Mr. Bulyea introduced a bill for the protection of wild birds and mammals, and Mr. A. E. Cross, one respecting the city of Calgary, both of which were read a first time. Mr. McKay moved for the correspondence in connection with the election of the school district. The bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of Athabasca passed the ordinary reading. The bill to amend the Ordinance incorporating the Saskatchewan Exploration company also passed its second reading.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATION ORIGIN.
Dr. McKay moved the second reading of a bill to amend the Medical Profession Ordinance, so that any person producing a diploma of qualification as a doctor of medicine, or a certificate that such diploma has been granted by examinations which entitle him to be registered as a member of the college of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba, should be allowed to be registered in the Territories upon payment of a fee of fifty dollars. At present any student must first pay the \$75 for registration in Manitoba, to avoid another examination in the Territories. Dr. McKay opposed the bill, because it was granting a special privilege to the University of Canada. He moved the six months' halt.

Dr. Gullis and Dr. Elliott opposed the bill on the same grounds. Dr. Elliott was in favor of more liberal legislation for the admission of qualified doctors.

Mr. A. S. Townsend and Mr. Thos. McKay supported the bill in the interests of the public.

Dr. Patrick said the amendments making it applicable to the whole Dominion could be moved when in committee of the whole. He would not object to that.

The House divided on the amendment, which was carried by 19 to 10.

PREMIER CLOSING AUTONOMY DEBATE.

Mr. Haultain, in closing the debate on provincial autonomy, said he felt somewhat under a disadvantage in taking up this subject, which had been discussed at so much length. However, a number of important questions had been raised during the debate and he felt that he would have to ask the House, even at this stage to allow him a short consideration of them. After three days' debate after the motion has been put and a lengthy amendment proposed, after a number of long speeches, the general result had been the important discovery that there are divergences of opinion with regard to the areas within which provincial institutions should be worked out. These divergences of opinion, which were mentioned by the Minister of the Interior, had been still more clearly indicated. So far as the other side of the discussion, especially as carried on by gentlemen on the right, the House went, it had only added to the confusion, which he fancied,

was pretty well possessed by the Minister of the Interior, that there are divergences of opinion with regard to the area of the proposed province. The reply which he proposed to make on the general debate was necessitated purely by the matters which were contained in the amendment, and by the statements made by hon. gentlemen in their speeches in support of the amendment. In his opinion the amendment was not relevant, in any sense, to the main motion. It introduced something which had nothing whatever to do with the main motion, and if hon. gentlemen wish to go on record, they would have found better opportunity by moving a specific amendment. He did not take the point of order because he did not wish to allow himself to be open to the charge of an attempt to bark discussion. Hon. gentlemen had attempted to read into his speech, on moving the motion, a meaning and significance it did not suggest. He had said distinctly that he did not ask an expression of opinion regarding the contents of the Memorial addressed to the Government, that the question of one or two or three provinces, or even annexation to Manitoba, was not even remotely concerned with the resolution. In spite of thimbleplay statement, hon. gentlemen had insisted, through wilful misinterpretation or misconception, upon reading a contrary meaning into it. They want to get the Government at Ottawa, that the postponement of the consideration of the question of provincial institutions in the West was justifiable, and they want, more than that, to say that they do not want to hasten the change until some unanimity has been obtained upon a subject which this debate has proved there never can be unanimity. The Opposition practically says: Because the Dominion Government has discovered there are divergences of opinion, we are going to vote want of confidence against the local administration by bringing in an amendment which simply proves that the Government's discovery is correct. The Dominion Government found there were divergences of opinion, therefore we will vote want of confidence in the local government because they held one opinion regarding this question.

DR. PATRICK AND PRIVATE CONVERSATIONS.

Before going into the general question, there were one or two features of the discussion he wished to notice. In speaking to the motion before, he had drawn attention to a statement of the hon. member for West Prince Albert, made on the public platform, and a private statement—that is, private as distinct from the platform or House statement—which was a distorted notion as being made in the rotunda of a Yorkton hotel. The hon. member for Yorkton (Dr. Patrick) took advantage of that statement, and accused him of having been guilty of a gross breach of parliamentary conduct in divulging a private conversation; and took advantage of the fact to divulge a private conversation between himself and the hon. member for Yorkton some three or four years ago. It was not necessary to explain to the House the difference between a statement made openly in a public hotel and a statement made in a private conversation. He did need to explain to his hon. friend the difference between a public statement, and a private conversation some years ago when according to his own statement, they were upon terms of a certain amount of political association; how long could political parties stand together if the moment a gentleman turned his coat, he was immediately at liberty to divulge and make public confidences which he received while intimately connected

with former associations? He would leave the subject at that. The hon. gentleman, with his versatile nature, had very quickly picked up the matter, and he had used it to his advantage. Whether the hon. gentleman was a political chameleon or simply a political mirror, he at least reflected the ideas, the sentiments, the manners and methods of those with whom he so lately had associated. He congratulated the hon. gentleman on having obtained the temporary aid of a gentleman whose record could never be considered more than a temporary auxiliary force. The hon. gentleman was ready to advance at times with his party, and then retreat; and as a matter of fact, he could size the hon. gentleman up generally as a political party, a source of embarrassment to his friends, of hope to his political enemies, and of speculation on the part of all who read the world. What a strange combination the hon. gentleman completes—a combination which, apart from a very few discordant notes which have been expressed on nearly all the important points of issue in this debate, has been wandering and wavering until now in a sort of dreary silence of negation. This haunting political party reminded him, in the words of the poet, of "An infant crying in the night," "A woman wailing for her lost one," "A man wailing for his lost one."

That statement apparently was in such a powerless state that they had been obliged to send for the doctor. (Laughter.) It would be interesting if they could only draw aside the veil of secrecy which of course must envelope the proceedings of political parties, if they could only be admitted for an evening to the deliberations of an evening when they are preparing their ammunition. It would be interesting to hear the hon. gentleman from Yorkton dilating on the golden beauty of silence to his leader (Mr. McDonald), or exchanging compliments with the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Bennett) in the way of assenting to the questionable maxim that the neutral justifies the end, in return for the hon. gentleman's disposition as consistency, which was given the other day. He would like to know whether the policy contained in the amendment was the result of the new political combination, or if it was simply a coincidence. If the former then they must attribute the authorship of the amendment to the hon. member for Yorkton; but he believed the only conclusion that gentleman would have when he came to reflect upon it, in the words of Touchstone, "It's a very ill-fortuned thing, sir, but mine own."

The Opposition had taken the position of Mr. Dooley when he wrote his presidential address. Mr. Dooley, in dealing with the great question of the Niagara Canal, said: "Something ought to be done for the Niagara Canal, but what the devil it is, I don't know." (Laughter.)

THE OPPOSITION ANALYSED.

He would like to analyse the position of this Opposition on the various provincial suggestions. We hear the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. McDonald) urging a settlement of this question, but as to the details he preserves silence. He regrets the delay, and then indulges in unwholesome glee that the Federal Government has thrown us down. He will not support a motion which simply presses upon the Dominion Government the desirability of immediately settling the question. The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Bennett), through an ardent

provincialist, ranks himself with his leader and seems to be pleased that no issue has been taken at Ottawa. He supports an amendment that simply insists that the question should be postponed until the next Legislature meets.

Then the hon. member from Yorkton (Dr. Patrick) has had certain and various opinions of this subject, and lest his new associates should be misled, his true position should now be explained to them. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman has had various theories. While he was free to confess that obstinacy was a vice, under certain circumstances, it was yet a most desirable thing under others. The hon. member could be relieved from any charge of either consistency or obstinacy so far as adherence to any phase of this important question goes. He admitted the other day at one time favoring the one province idea; on another occasion he had argued that the faith of the Dominion was pledged to the constitution of the three provincial districts—Athabasca, Alberta and Saskatchewan. Later on we find him with a new god. As late as 1890, he proposed a scheme of two provincial provinces. What that meant, the speaker did not exactly know. The hon. gentleman talks of the language of the earlier gods, sometimes, in discussing this question. It was to divide the country up in two, with an eastern and a western division, which should be made provinces at some indefinite date in the future. The hon. gentleman in support of his proposition, argued that the establishment of a union should be pending as long as possible. It would be undesirable that some of the larger powers should be extended at that time. He proposed, however, that these two provincial provinces should be established under a Legislative union, with one Legislature governing the one of them; and through this state of affairs might go on for a very long time—possibly for 10 years. Then he drew an analogy between these two provincial provinces, and the Legislative union which existed between Upper and Lower Canada; and because they had been able, in spite of their many differences, to go on satisfactorily and amicably for 25 or 30 years, he thought that would be an early enough period for the two districts to be put into two provinces.

Dr. Patrick. On that occasion I pointed out that the States of the American Union were giving back money to the States, even the borrowing powers. Mr. Haultain. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he was in favor of the borrowing powers being extended to the two provincial provinces?

Dr. Patrick. Certainly. Mr. Haultain. Well, that only indicates another of those quick changes in which the hon. gentleman is such an artist. Within less than six months of that date, the hon. gentleman has paupered issued for the information of the constituents, at the time he was getting his mandate, made this statement:

"I need scarcely point out to the older residents of the Yorkton district that not only in the Legislature, but outside of it, I have an opportunity to urge that the matter of establishing a province, the provinces should be done as early as possible, so that the Legislature power to mortgage the future of this young country by borrowing money on the public credit." (Cheers.)

Of course, I do not seek to fasten on the hon. gentleman this vice of consistency; I am not accusing him of that. (Laughter.) I am simply trying to point out the various changes of opinion that the hon. gentleman has made since his opinion was in 1890, and then go back six months from that date and see what his opinion was in October, 1898, when he was getting his mandate. The hon. gentleman at that time in his proposal of two provincial provinces, certainly did not refer to the borrowing powers. If he did, then of course it saves him to a certain extent from the charge I have made against him. At the same time it leaves him in the position of what was the use of two provincial provinces. If they had all the powers of provinces? Then fancy the provincial provinces under one Legislative union, deciding how much each of them should borrow! If this proposition is not proof that the hon. gentleman is not guilty of the vice of consistency, it is certainly proof that he is inclined to indulge in some visionary schemes. Now, I will ask a little more attention to the statements the hon. gentleman made at the time he was receiving his mandate. This document I have in my hands is entitled, "Facing the future of the North-West Territories, compiled for the electors of Yorkton," and dated October 19th, 1898. Now the hon. gentleman is discussing his amendment, has more than once said that the Government had no mandate, that the Legislature had no mandate, nobody had a mandate, and we had to have a general election before a mandate could be given. The pamphlet says:

"Electors of Yorkton.—The agitation which has been fostered in the neighborhood of Calgary for some years, to have the two provincial provinces established as a province with Calgary as its capital, and the agitation aroused by the Premier of the Territories on the question of the establishment of a province in the Territories, make it incumbent on candidates for election to the next Legislature to discuss with electors, this most important question."

Now, for what reason, as a rule, do candidates discuss questions with their electors before elections? Is it not in order that the electors can give them an opinion, or for the purpose of telling electors what they, as candidates, believe regarding public questions, and ask to be sent to represent those views in the Legislature? The hon. gentleman says:

"I need scarcely point out that I have not an opportunity to urge that the matter be delayed as long as possible. It is too soon to give our Local Legislature power to mortgage the future of this young country by borrowing money on the public credit."

In October 1898 (the statement was that, "It was too soon to give the Legislature the power to mortgage the future of this young country by borrowing money," and in the following April, 1899, the hon. gentleman says he made the argument on the analogy of the American states that we should establish two provincial provinces with all the powers of a province to borrow money. Not only did the hon. gentleman state the fact of his conviction, but he indulged in a little prophetic map drawing, and showed what in his opinion these provinces should be. The hon. gentleman says: "One province or two provinces—that is the question, and then he undertakes in the blithe way in which he undertakes to do other people's business, to carve out a very much enlarged province of Manitoba. He then indicates by figures that there are two provinces of 220,000 square miles each, and his