

bring about such terrific results as to fairly drive everybody on both sides of the House into acquiescence. Then the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior turned up, and if ever there was a panic stricken crew it was this government and their supporters for the next thirty days. There was another gentleman who was not consulted, although that gentleman was here at the time. I refer to the premier of the Northwest Territories. Mr. Haultain was here, not in his personal capacity, but in the capacity of the premier of these Territories, and the statement has been made in the public press, and it has not been denied, that this Bill was only handed to Mr. Haultain an hour before it was ready to be presented to the House, and no time was allowed for him to properly digest it, to discuss it with his colleague who was here with him, or to give an opportunity for proper consideration or reflection in regard to its provisions. This lack of consideration is on a par with the treatment that was accorded him afterwards by the government, because, when the second Bill was brought down, the right hon. leader of the government stated in a cavalier way that he did not allow Mr. Haultain to see the Bill at all. That statement is on record. Did the right hon. gentleman think that the proper way to reconcile people, to conciliate the people, was to tell their premier who came here as the accredited representative of the Northwest Territories that he would not condescend to show him the legislation that the government proposed to submit? Well, then we had these terrible thirty days of suspense and agony. We saw the government marching and counter-marching, we saw hon. members lobbying around the corridors wondering what was to be the next move, and then we heard the statement made by the hon. member for Brandon as to the stand he took. That hon. gentleman came back, and within three or four days after his entrance into the city we know what happened. The right hon. Prime Minister rose up in his place and announced that he had received the resignation of the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of the Interior made a speech on that occasion which showed a determination upon his part to oppose this Bill and to oppose any legislation to this end, if the English language meant anything. But, Sir, no sooner had the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior announced his intention to defeat this Bill, if it were possible, than all the force and power of government press were turned upon the hon. member for Brandon. Insinuations were made as to his conduct while in the discharge of his duties as Minister of the Interior. One of the Quebec papers, and a strong supporter of the government, came out with a cartoon. Did they depict the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior as dying for principle? Did they depict him as a man who could not support the government by reason of the strong views which he held? No, Sir; they de-

Mr. BENNETT.

icted the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior as a man who was fleeing from the wrath, from the exposures which were to be made. There had been scandals in his department, and the pistol was put at his head by the other ministers through the press, and the hon. member for Brandon was simply and solely told if he did not acquiesce in legislation that would be acceptable to hon. gentlemen opposite he must expect what would follow—exposure and disgrace by reason of scandals connected with his department. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot gainsay this. It was in the public press, and no member of the government has risen in his place to express a word of dissent in connection with these ideas which have been disseminated by the press friendly to the government. But if this legislation is along lines that are compatible with the principles and views of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior, why did not the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior come back into the House and take his place? That is a question that must suggest itself to the people. If the legislation was to his mind, he should have come back as a hero and have said that he had stemmed the whole tide of this policy, and forced them to come into accord with his views on this question; but this has not been done, and the public must draw their own deductions that the threats held out by the ministerial press and the insinuations made against that hon. gentleman were the influences that brought him back. Now, we have heard a great deal about the constitutional triumph of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior. But we have not heard a word about the terrible downfall that his party got in Manitoba the other day—not a word. Hon. gentlemen opposite went to a riding of their own selection and they won. But there was the riding of Mountain in Manitoba, and the hon. gentleman who represents Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) was delegated to go up there. He was accompanied by a number of hon. gentlemen from the province of Manitoba; but, Sir, there is no acclaim for them, there is no applause. These hon. gentlemen have found that in the west, in any riding of strong Liberal proclivities, where the population is not strongly foreign, they can only court one thing, and that is disaster, such as they met with in Manitoba.

Now, this question has been discussed from both sides. I shall not repeat the words of the hon. Postmaster General—from the lawyer's standpoint and from the statesman's standpoint. I shall use the words that are commonly used—from the legal point of view and from what may be termed the sentimental point of view. What is the legal point of view? First and foremost, it is a matter of comment, and it must be a matter of comment, that although this debate has gone on week after week, no hon. gentleman, until to-day, in the person of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), has risen to give an official legal