

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What I presume he intended to refer to is column 5987 of 'Hansard' in which the following appears :

Mr. INGRAM. If I recollect aright they have no lists, and for my part I would not agree to have the local law adopted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We had better let this clause remain in suspense, and I will see how far I can go to adopt the Bill introduced last session.

Is that the reference ?

Mr. INGRAM. Not at all.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Where is it ?

Mr. INGRAM. I will give it.

Mr. SPROULE. I was listening to the hon. minister, and the impression he left on my mind was that there were no lists. I thought that rather a strange statement, because I knew there had been lists printed for this constituency.

Mr. INGRAM. I have never yet made a statement knowingly in this House knowing it to be a false statement.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say that, Had I thought that, I would have said it, but I did not.

Mr. INGRAM. I might add that I have never made a statement in this House which, if I found afterwards it was a misstatement of fact and any hon. gentleman drew my attention to it, I did not withdraw and apologize for it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I accept my hon. friend's apology.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not making an apology in this instance.

Mr. OLIVER. We have heard our friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) to-night making good his threat of last night about putting up obstruction on this Bill until possibly the snow flew. That is his privilege, and with that privilege I shall not quarrel. I would suggest however to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) that he should give his attention to the manner in which one of his followers, not from the front benches, is exercising his privilege of obstruction, and to the courteous manner in which he does so and the language he uses. I would suggest also to the leader of the opposition that if he has any lectures to give to back benchers, he might very well devote them to his friends who sit so close behind him.

Mr. INGRAM. They are very far back benches.

Mr. OLIVER. Not so far back as they should be. I do not wish to assist in the obstruction of business by following the hon. member through all the devious course of his argument. I do not suppose that he

himself knows how far he wandered ; but we all know his conclusion, was that he was going to vote against the government measure. But we knew that before he started, so that his explanation was not necessary on that point. The only point I wish to deal with—and I do not wish really to deal with it because the hon. gentleman alluded to it, but because it has also been taken up in the press—is the nationality and religion of the people of the electoral district of Edmonton. I notice that the Conservative press have devoted their attention to that question as an excuse for the cowardice of the opposition in not having carried out the challenge they made to this government week after week. When they had an opportunity to make good their challenges and threats, instead of attempting to do so they took satisfaction out of abusing and misrepresenting the people whose verdict they had challenged.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not abusing the people.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman should explain what words were used on this side to warrant his assertion.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that our friends are squealing very quickly. They should not leave themselves so open, and they would not have cause to complain. They claim to be the champions of the rights and liberties of the Northwest and of provincial autonomy in that country ; but when a section of the Northwest declares its mind contrary to their views, at once they proceed to attempt to discredit that expression of opinion and to argue that it is not worthy of consideration. I think, therefore, that in view of the attitude which has been assumed so energetically by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and the Conservative press throughout the country, the people of the Northwest will take warning that if they want provincial rights they must not look to the party opposite for the advocacy or sanction of those rights. Whether the people of the constituency of Edmonton are Galicians or whatever else they are, they are residents of the Northwest, citizens of Canada, and British subjects, and they are the people upon whom this alleged iniquitous legislation is to be enforced. And if they are not entitled to be heard on that question, I would ask where are our rights of provincial autonomy ? Are we to take our legislation from this fair province of Ontario in provincial matters ? These very gentlemen who are arguing that we should be left free, are the gentlemen who are obstructing the business of this House systematically and persistently with the view of discrediting the deliberately expressed opinion of an important section of the people of the Northwest.