

opposite of the principle that has been lately enunciated by the leader of the government. I would point out that the quotations the right hon. gentleman has given from the utterances of hon. George Brown will not gloss over the inconsistency he has shown or make more tenable the unstable position he has taken. The hour is late and in conclusion, I would only desire, if the right hon. Prime Minister were in his place to contrast the position he took in 1895 and 1896, when he was on this side of the House, with the utterance he has recently made. I would contrast the inflammatory addresses which he then made in this House and on the hustings advocating provincial rights and non-interference with the acts of provincial legislatures, with his present speeches. And I would refer the right hon. gentleman to the words of the Hon. George Brown on the subject of the stability, and consistency that ought to be the ornament and the crown of the Prime Minister of a country of the importance of Canada. In 1896 the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) took a certain position in order to obtain power. And now, after his third return, we have him laying down a policy which is the absolute negation of that which he contended for in 1896. Let him consider the words of Hon. George Brown: 'If, Sir, a public man can avow certain principles, agitate those principles and seek to overthrow the government of the day to establish those principles, and, when he obtains power laughs at his professions and casts his principles to the winds, he is aiming a blow at public morality.'

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). At this late hour, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House. But, in view of the Bill introduced by the Prime Minister on the 21st of February, in view of the large number of inquiries that are being made from time to time concerning it, and in view of the rumours that are in circulation, I have not been in a position, up to this evening, to give a definite answer to those who have asked me whether the government proposed to carry the Bill through the House as it has been introduced or not. So, I wish to compliment the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) for being so frank as he was this evening, for he has stated that when he framed this Bill he framed it on the line of the legislation already affecting the people of the Northwest Territories. That being true, I am in a position to state exactly what the government propose to do in the matter of this legislation. The Minister of Justice stated that there could be no peace except it were based on justice. There are a large number of people in this country who do not believe in the present system in the Northwest Territories being carried out by any law passed by the Dominion parliament. I would like to ask him whether he believes that

Mr. BOYCE.

those who oppose this legislation are doing what they ought not to do? And will he say that there shall be no peace in this country if his so-called justice is not meted out to the people of the Northwest? The Minister of Justice is the man above all others in this House who should keep an even temper, should calmly consider all questions coming before him and should be particularly guarded in the remarks he makes, for it is to his department that the people look for good advice based upon calmness and judgment. I was sorry therefore, to observe, the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech to-night. He has charged hon. members on this side with appealing to prejudice. He was not a member of this House in the first session of 1896. Had he been, how would he have found his friends occupied? The government of that day, after introducing a Bill in this House, were trying to get it into committee to have it considered on its merits. But hon. gentlemen opposite then on this side, showed no willingness to have this carried out. They even remained for one hundred and twenty-nine hours without rest, keeping this House in session, for the purpose of preventing that Bill being considered by the House. And, on the one hand we found members in the opposition of that day standing up and condemning the government because the Bill went too far. On the other hand some condemned it because it did not go far enough. Still others condemned the financial arrangements as unsatisfactory. But, on all sides, they were fanning the flames of prejudice, and it was through the existence of these prejudices that they came into power in 1896. So far as the present opposition is concerned nothing of this kind has been done. No man on this side, so far as I can learn, has expressed his opinion in regard to that legislation. They have carefully waited to see what the government would do in the matter—and rightly so. The leader of the government has told us that amendments may be introduced. But, thank goodness, the Minister of Justice, with his frankness has stated exactly the position the government is in. And, when the First Minister proceeds with the second reading of the Bill, I have no doubt that the same good judgment will be displayed and the same calm criticism given by the opposition, whether they agree or disagree with the Bill. Whatever hon. members on this side may say will be in parliamentary form and will be the result of calm consideration and not of mere prejudice. The Minister of Justice tried to work up a little agitation about the Toronto 'Telegram'. Everybody who knows the 'Telegram' knows that it is an independent paper with Conservative leanings. It is almost as likely to condemn the Conservative party as to condemn the Liberal party. The Conservative party would not hold itself