

\$600 of shortage was made up. No punishment seems to have been given, if this state of things as alleged is true, except that a not altogether unusual punishment has been meted out by the present government, namely, that he has lately been appointed to a higher and more lucrative position as immigration agent in southern Alberta. I commend this statement of alleged facts to the minister and I would like very much if, to-morrow, he should be able to make a statement to the House as to whether it is correct or not.

#### PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought we were going to have a statement in regard to clause 2 and then finish the discussion later on in connection with that clause?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thought we were to reserve clause 2 until we reached clause 16. My hon. friends were discussing the two clauses together. It seems to me that the question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) last night is intimately connected with the provisions of clause 16.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I understood was that we would have a little discussion about clause 2 for the purpose of obtaining some information from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice which I thought would be of service in facilitating the discussion on section 16 when we reach it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am quite agreeable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rather understood that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would in that connection be able to say to the House, or would undertake to state to the House to-day what the effect of section 16 upon section 2 would be. My hon. friend did not understand that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. I do not mean to discuss section 16 until we reach it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I would like to make one or two observations in regard to section 2. My hon. friend is not ready to discuss that particular feature of the question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Whatever may suit my hon. friend's convenience I am willing to agree to. I am willing to take up section 2 now if he chooses to do so. I thought I had said almost all I could say on this subject of any value to the committee, but at the same time I am quite willing to conform to anything the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that I fully understand the exact position the

Mr. FOSTER.

government takes with regard to the combined effect of sections 2 and 16. There has been a good deal of diversity of opinion on the subject among gentlemen who are versed in the law and to whose opinion some attention should be paid. I would like, however, to make one or two observations as to whether or not it is proper and expedient to discuss this question from the constitutional standpoint, and I do so because certain gentlemen in this House have seen fit to make severe criticism upon the mode in which I dealt with this question. I refer more particularly to words that proceeded from my hon. friend for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Laurence). My hon. friend from Colchester was good enough to suggest that I had dealt with this question from a constitutional standpoint because I lacked the courage to deal with it in any other way. Well, I do not know that I regard that taunt very much from the hon. gentleman, because I do not know that during his career, of which I have some knowledge, he has been specially conspicuous for any unusual display of courage. Be that as it may, I would commend him to the words and arguments of the Prime Minister who, both on the 21st of February and on the 22nd of March, made his argument in this House solely from the constitutional standpoint. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Colchester, whether or not he attributes that course on the part of his leader to that lack of courage which he was good enough to impute to me. My hon. friend from Labelle gave a description of himself in this House—he is very fond of describing himself—and on this occasion he came before the House, to use his own words, as 'a cool and common sense outsider'; and as a cool and common sense outsider, without particularly referring to me by name, he made some observations which were evidently intended for me. I regret that that hon. gentleman, as usual, is not in the House, and I do not know that I would have any opportunity of making these observations if I waited for his return, so I shall be obliged to proceed in his absence. The hon. gentleman was very tender at this particular part of his speech to those who had displayed what he called passion and prejudice. He said that those emotions proceeded from the noblest feelings of our nature, although later on he used very strong language with regard to any display of passion and prejudice. At this portion of his speech it suited him very well to say that he did not object to passion or prejudice, but he was particular to criticise those who had dealt with this question from a constitutional standpoint. He said:

The men who are committing a crime against this nation are those who having opinions of their own are trying to shelter themselves un-