

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Notwithstanding the emphasis that the gentleman (Mr. Lake) who has just sat down, has used in his statements, I hardly think that much importance is to be attached to them. The statement I made in the House was that at a meeting held in Indian Head, Premier Haultain was reported by the Regina 'Leader' to have said:

With the school system you are fairly well contented, so I need not dwell on the subject.

I have the Regina 'Leader' here containing the report in question, and that report is accessible to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) had he taken the trouble to verify it. He did not take the trouble to do so, but was content to refer to a document that no one else had access to. Now, with regard to the resolution passed by the Territorial Assembly. I quoted the resolution, I said that Mr. Haultain voted against it and I gave the evidence in support of it. Where is the inaccuracy? As to the hon. gentleman's imputation with regard to me I must be terribly humiliated at the thought that he should think so little of me; I accept that expression of opinion on his part with all due humility and I think that possibly I may survive it.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to hear the full report of the debate which the Minister of Justice quoted, because I wish to put myself right. I endeavoured to find, and I have asked three times now for the Regina 'Leader' of December, 1901, which I believe contained a full report of this debate. However, what I wished to call the attention of the House to was—and I think it will be borne out by the Regina 'Leader' if it reported the debate in full—that Mr. Haultain was referring to the system of grants, and that it was misleading the House to simply quote that sentence without showing the connection in which it was used. With reference to the statements which I called attention to with regard to the resolutions in the legislative assembly, I say that to quote one resolution and to omit to quote another which followed very shortly afterwards is also distinctly misleading.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us first deal with the 'Leader.' The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) says he could not find the 'Leader'; I called a page boy and sent him to the library and within five minutes I had it here on my desk. Number one. Now, let us deal with this question of the report. I have the 'Leader' here published at Regina, Thursday morning, January 2nd, 1902. The heading is:

The proposition outlined by Premier Haultain at the Indian Head meeting for provincial establishment. Continuation of Mr. Haultain's reply to the case for annexation as set out by Premier Roblin, of Manitoba. Except as regards railways, the Territorial position even now is preferable. Public lands and compensation.

Mr. LAKE.

Then it goes on to give Mr. Haultain's speech and the heading is:

Good roads, railways, schools, and water.

The report goes on to say:

In Manitoba unless you like to form a municipality you will get very few roads given to you, while with our system you will get them without the burdensome and expensive system of municipalities and the liability of the provincial levy.

Next:

With the school system you are fairly well contented, so I need not dwell on the subject.

Next:

As to the water supply, you all know what our Public Works Department is doing, so now I come to railways.

In what respect does the context vary the words I have quoted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. We are face to face with rather a unique situation on the present occasion. We have been debating this question now for six or eight weeks, and we have yet failed to draw from the author of these clauses, what their meaning is. This is one of the advantages of being a lawyer and a Minister of Justice; you can put in phraseology that the ordinary lay mind cannot comprehend, and you can be face to face with that for several weeks and then have the Minister of Justice whose duty it is to interpret to this House and to this country the meaning of legislation, refusing to give information until the rest of the Bill is through. In other words, he has pocketed the votes of all the gentlemen behind him as well as a number on this side of the House, on a resolution that is not comprehended and he positively refuses up to date to tell us the meaning of it. I contend that this is not right. If the author of that legislation does not know the meaning of it who does? If the author of the legislation does know the meaning of it, it is his duty to explain it so that we may be not further misled. I had the pleasure of hearing the Minister of Finance for a few moments this afternoon and he told us that several events have happened recently, the principle of which was the return of the Minister of the Interior unopposed. The Minister of Finance might also have pointed to Centre Toronto. That is a good deal nearer Ottawa than Edmonton, and we had more time to get to Centre Toronto than to Edmonton. The government did not put up a candidate in Centre Toronto although there was not 500 Conservative majority in that riding as a rule, whereas the Minister of the Interior had a solid 2,000 majority or more at his back. Further, they had the opportunity of being up there and of putting up a campaign that could not have been overcome in the time at the disposal of us on this side. If