

remind him that he has already spoken once. \*

Mr. FOSTER. I spoke not on the adjournment but on the ministerial explanation, and I am now calling the attention of the First Minister to the question I have just put. I also want to call his attention to something else. It is in the interests of the country that we should know whether two or three days ago, after conferring with the Minister of the Interior, my right hon. friend still had hopes that the Minister of the Interior would accede to what was evidently a proposition put to him, possibly in modification of this clause of the Bill, and that his resignation at the last moment came as a disappointment. It would be interesting to the House to know whether the right hon. gentleman made any advance towards a compromise in the Bill as presented, in order to retain his colleague in the cabinet. I want to call to the attention of my right hon. friend two other matters, which I may as well bring before him now, as otherwise I should have to call his attention to them later. I find that in the printed Bill there are material alterations as compared with the Bill laid on the table, when introduced by the right hon. gentleman. What is the cause for these modifications? Have some modifications been made between the time this Bill was introduced and the time when it was sent to the printer, with a view of retaining in the government the Minister of the Interior or any other aggrieved minister? When my hon. friend here to my right asked for the printing of a larger number of copies of the Bill, it struck me that perhaps there was method in not printing too many copies, because, before the next printing takes place, it may possibly be that some other clauses will be modified in order to retain members who are at present recalcitrant, or to gain the favour of those who are opposed to the Bill as it stands. But I call my right hon. friend's attention to this peculiarity, that some of the clauses of the Bill which he put in Mr. Speaker's hands do not appear in these Bills, the swamp lands clause for instance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. I had a copy of the Bill and read it, and I am sure that was not in the Bill. I merely mention the matter so that the right hon. gentleman may notice it. There is one other thing I would like to speak of. We have had placed in our hands what purports to be a history from official sources of the legislation of the united provinces of the Dominion since confederation. I do not know to whose courtesy we are indebted for this. It is useful in its way, so far as it goes. But it has been stated in the public press that it was arranged and collated by the Secretary of State,

and publicity has been given to that statement, and it is believed by a great many people. I do not know whether that is the case or not. I have no objection to the government giving us all and the fullest information with reference to the subject, but I do object to the government putting anything in circulation as official information if it has been done under the auspices I have mentioned, and as has been reported in the press, because the information is more than a statement of facts, and is shaped into an argument from the beginning to support the contention of the government. I hope my right hon. friend will be able to say that this has not been prepared by the government or any member of the government, or officials connected with the government. It seems to bear the impress of being printed in the Government Printing Bureau, though that may not be the case. However, as that has been current, I bring it to the attention of my right hon. friend so that he may mention it, if he will be kind enough to do so, in connection with the other points I have raised.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). In order to emphasize some of the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I wish to draw the attention of the premier to a statement he made in the ministerial correspondence which he read as having taken place between him and his late colleague. It is to my mind a very curious statement. He said that in consultation with his colleague he hoped he would be able to yield somewhat to his views so as to retain him in the cabinet. Now what the House wants is a clear cut statement from the premier whether he is wedded to that particular clause of the Bill regarding separate schools, or whether he is prepared to do what his colleague wishes him to do in order to retain him in the cabinet, and in order to meet the wishes of a great number of his supporters in the House in that direction. The difficulties may be all removed, there may be such an alteration in that clause as that it may receive the support of the whole House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no observation of any kind to offer to the House on this occasion, because the occasion does not call for any observation from me beyond the statement which has been made by myself and by my late colleague, the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). The hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) knows better than anybody that on such an occasion ministerial explanations are to be given when a gentleman withdraws from the administration, and it is left to the prime minister and to the minister withdrawing to make such explanations as they deem fit. I rise simply to answer one question, though it is not at all pertinent to the issue, because everything that has been said here on this occasion beyond that which