

trouble to look up 'Hansard' during the last parliamentary term, or any one who has listened to the hon. gentleman when he has, time and again, made the most unwarranted personal attacks, especially upon the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) the proverbial red rag to the bull, he cannot but feel that the hon. gentleman has fallen far below the high standard which he tells us he assumed when he came into this House.

Mr. SPROULE. He was throwing bouquets at himself.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And they were not petrified bouquets either. We have not to go further than the hon. gentleman's speech of last Friday to prove the accuracy of my statement that the hon. gentleman has fallen away from the high standard which he says at one time was his. We who had the privilege of listening to the hon. gentleman on Friday will realize the very severe and uncalled for, not to say unkind and utterly unwarranted, attack which he made upon the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories. He could scarcely say anything too bad of that hon. gentleman. He called him a rank partisan, and said he was guilty of the grossest misrepresentation ever indulged in in the whole Dominion of Canada. This hyperbole—let us call it, though rather a mild term to express our feelings—gives one an idea of how the hon. gentleman has fallen away from the standard which, he says, was his early in his parliamentary career.

But the leader of the opposition also came in for criticism of a most unfair kind in connection with his speech of last Friday. Not only was the hon. gentleman unfair to the premier of the Territories, but he was most unfair in garbling the utterances of the leader of the opposition. The leader of the opposition had taken a certain stand on the land clause, he took the position that these lands should be handed over to the new provinces, that they should be administered by the new provinces in the interest of the people residing there, and he took up the argument used by the leader of the government and some other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, contending that they should not hand these lands over, as it might interfere with the immigration policy of the Dominion government. Touching upon that question, the leader of the opposition spoke as follows:

Are they not the people chiefly interested? May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration?

Now, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) left out that portion of the sentence completely. He started in the middle of a sentence, and he finished before the end of the sentence, finished at a comma

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

and tried to create a wrong impression, entirely contrary to that which the hon. leader of the opposition intended to convey to the members of this House. This is where the member for West Assiniboia began the quotation:

May I not further suggest that even if there were any danger—and I do not think there is—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of these lands,—

Now, there is a comma, that is where the member for West Assiniboia stopped, and he did not quote the following words which I will now read:

—and obtain to it the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories.

Had he quoted that last portion of the sentence it would have done away with the force of his argument. He tried to make out that this expression on the part of the leader of the opposition was an infringement and a gross violation of provincial rights. But had he included the latter expression, 'and obtain the consent of the people of the Northwest Territories,' of course it would have taken away entirely the ground for his contention. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman who is aspiring to the vacant portfolio of the Minister of the Interior. The member for West Assiniboia has stated in this House and in public meetings that he was opposed to the autonomy before the Canadian Pacific Railway tax-exemption was finally settled; and I am credibly informed that, either at Moosejaw or Medicine Hat, during the last campaign, he stated that he would vote against an Autonomy Bill unless, before that measure was produced, the question of the tax exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway was entirely settled, that it would be dangerous on the part of the Dominion to grant autonomy to the Territories before that question had been finally adjudicated by the Privy Council. Now, has that question been finally passed upon? It is true that it has passed through the courts of Manitoba, it is true that there has been an appeal to the Supreme Court, and the decision of the Manitoba courts has been reversed; but it still has to run the gauntlet of the Privy Council, and we know how frequently Supreme Court decisions are overthrown by the Privy Council. Still this question is not settled, it is still open for decision, and the member for West Assiniboia is giving his hearty endorsement and support to this Bill in face of the pledges he made to his electors on this question.

Now, I have here some quotations from the hon. gentleman's own paper, and I will read from the Regina 'Leader' of October 22, 1903. This paper is edited by the hon. gentleman himself. I find that the hon. gentleman writing from Ottawa, no doubt