

Mr. LAKE. The resolution was introduced and it is perfectly accurate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then where is the inaccuracy?

Mr. LAKE. I am coming to it presently if the hon. Minister of Justice will kindly have a little patience. What are the facts? I will try to state them as briefly as I possibly can. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who was in the legislative assembly at the time and knows the facts will correct me if I am wrong. At the time this resolution was introduced there was a constitutional struggle going on in the House. The advisers of the lieutenant governor were holding office in opposition to the wishes of the majority of the members of the House. They had not the confidence of the members of the House and they were holding their positions as advisers of the lieutenant governor in spite of them.

In consequence of this state of things, the majority of the members of that House would not allow any resolution by the advisory board to pass. They would not even allow a motion to adjourn the House to pass. This resolution was thrown out as was every other motion presented. But a short time later on in the same session, a resolution was moved on behalf of the majority which, if not in the same words, was precisely to the same effect, and it was carried without division. I might read that second resolution:

On motion of Mr. Cayley, seconded by Mr. Haultain—

This is the gentleman, who, the Minister of Finance says, of course voted against the resolution and in favour of separate schools.

—it was resolved that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, praying him to communicate to the Governor General in Council the following memorial from the legislative assembly:

That this assembly did, at its last session, present a humble memorial to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, and to His Excellency's Minister of the Interior, making certain representations with regard to many matters of interest to the Territories, including, among others: (1) representations with regard to the present form of local government in the Territories; (2) the finances of the Territories; (3) sections 14 and 110 of the existing Northwest Territories Act. That no action with reference to many of these matters had been taken by His Excellency's government. That the assembly humbly reiterates its representations then made; and that the legislative assembly humbly prays that action be taken thereon.

If the Minister of Justice, who must have been studying the journals of the legislative assembly, had taken the trouble to read just a few pages further on, he would have seen that there was no warrant for his making the statement that Mr. Haultain had

voted against the resolution and in favour of maintaining the present conditions.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did he vote against the resolution?

Mr. LAKE. He certainly voted against that first resolution. If the Minister of Justice thinks that that is the proper way to put facts before the House, then I am satisfied to leave it to his own conscience. For my part, I think, it would be more in keeping with the dignity of his position if he gave the whole of the facts and not merely a few of them. But there is another statement which the hon. minister made. He made two references to the feelings of the Northwest Territories in the matter of separate schools. The second statement is as follows:

But that is not all; we have something even more recent. We have heard quite recently about the extension of the Manitoba boundaries and the desirability of extending those boundaries has been dwelt upon. And in that connection we have heard references more forcible than polite to a gentleman who is supposed to have been in some way connected with the matter, notwithstanding his formal denial. But what has that to do with the school question in the Northwest Territories? I shall be asked. Let me draw attention to the fact that as recently as 1901 a joint debate took place at Indian Head, in eastern Assinibola, between Mr. Roblin and Mr. Haultain upon this very question of the Manitoba boundary. Mr. Roblin put forth the reason why the people of that little place should declare themselves to be in favour of the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, at the expense of the Northwest Territories, Mr. Haultain, on the other hand, arguing against the proposition and seeking to convince the people that it was to their interest to remain in the Northwest Territories, and that the boundaries of Manitoba should not extend westward. And what, Sir, were the reasons given by Mr. Haultain to induce them to resist the blandishments of Mr. Roblin and oppose the extension of the Manitoba boundary? The joint debate is reported in the Regina 'Leader' of January 20th, 1902, and Mr. Haultain's argument is summed up in these words: Good roads, railways, schools, water. Referring to the school question he says: with the school system you are fairly well contented, so I need not dwell upon the subject.

That was the quotation made by the hon. the Minister of Justice. Again he stated only half the truth. Had he gone on even to finish Mr. Haultain's sentences, he would have found that an entirely different construction would have been placed upon what he said. Unfortunately I have not been able to get the Regina 'Leader' in which the report of the original debate is given. The Minister of Justice says it was on the 20th of January, 1902. I looked up the Regina 'Leader' of that date and found that the report of the debate was not in it. The number of December, 1901, in which I believe the report was given, is missing from the library; and although I have asked for it two or three times, I

Mr. FITZPATRICK.