

enforce the right to govern ourselves and will not have our rights and our liberties stolen from us by such methods as these. I consider that by their distribution of the constituencies alone the Government are responsible to a certain extent for the crimes that have taken place in that far northern country. But this was not all. The government did not feel entirely safe in simply putting the votes in those districts where they could control them. The electoral machinery must be in the hands of men who would employ the criminals to perpetrate frauds such as those which were practised, and which could be practised only with the connivance of the election officials. And so Mr. Haultain was deposed. It has been stated that Mr. Haultain, after the resignation of certain members of the legislative assembly to run in the Dominion elections, had no longer a majority of members of the territorial assembly; but, taking the province of Saskatchewan, that is entirely untrue. Mr. Haultain had a majority of the members of the province of Saskatchewan still at his back at the time he was deposed from being the prime minister of that province.

I was very glad that the Prime Minister came out to-day with a straight statement that he was not in any way concerned with the action of Mr. Forget in calling upon Mr. Scott, because I can assure him that there was a very general opinion throughout the whole Northwest that the deposition of Mr. Haultain and the calling of Mr. Scott were due to the influence of the Prime Minister himself. In fact, it was only the other day that a letter written by Mr. Scott himself to one of his supporters at Drinkwater was published with Mr. Scott's own consent in order to prove some point in connection with the elections; and in that letter, which was dated the 21st of July last from the House of Commons here, Mr. Scott said this:

I may say that Laurier all along has seemed to be of the opinion that Haultain ought to be called as premier of one of the provinces. Had Haultain acted with any approach at propriety under the circumstances I believe that Laurier would have absolutely refused to pass him over. His whole conduct, however, from first to last in this business has been execrable. His going into Oxford and London, combined with the threat he made at Woodstock on election night to stir up a school question in one of the new provinces if he obtained control, compelled Laurier to change his mind.

I am therefore very glad that the Prime Minister has spoken out, and I think he may well ask to be saved from his friends when they write and make such an accusation against him. Then, with regard to the Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan and his reasons for selecting a partisan to carry on the government, here is what Mr. Scott himself said in his address to the electors of Lumsden:

Mr. LAKE.

A word respecting the fact that Mr. Haultain is not the first premier of Saskatchewan seems called for. The selection of another by the representative of the Crown was due to the attitude which Mr. Haultain adopted towards our new provincial constitution. . . . The selection of myself was doubtless due to the Liberal party in the province having induced me some time previously to accept the leadership of the party. That the Crown acted upon Liberal advice is a charge I shall not try to refute. . . . The truth is that Mr. Haultain's conduct made him a simple impossibility for selection.

That is Mr. Scott's idea of what the truth is, and no doubt he is sincere in stating it. I myself think the truth was that it was absolutely necessary for the future of this government that those Bills should be endorsed by the provinces of the Northwest, and they were prepared to take the readiest means at hand to secure that endorsement.

The Prime Minister this afternoon made a charge against Mr. Haultain in regard to the autonomy legislation. He stated that Mr. Haultain in London and North Oxford would do all in his power—not that he said he would, but that was the gist of his speeches—to destroy the constitution; and further, that he had avowed his intention of putting a ruthless hand upon the constitution. Now, I think that any one who studies the action of Mr. Haultain must know perfectly well that that is a most unfair interpretation to put upon his speeches and his action. It was not that he wished to lay a ruthless hand upon the constitution but that he desired to appeal to the Privy Council in England in order to prevent the First Minister from laying a ruthless hand and violating, as he had done, the constitution of British North America. Mr. Haultain took no partisan course. He acted as a non-partisan and ran his election campaign as a non-partisan pure and simple. It is well known that he took no stand upon the school question and would practically not allow it to be brought into the campaign until the religious and racial question had been ruthlessly thrust into that province by the memo, of the Archbishop of St. Boniface. It had been known for a considerable time previous that pressure was being brought upon the members of the Roman Catholic church to vote for the friends of separate schools, as the archbishop's memo, put it; but it was only very shortly before the close of the campaign that that memo, came into the hands of the provincial rights party and Mr. Haultain was forced to take the stand which he could have taken earlier and which, if he had not been a man of honour, he would have taken earlier in the campaign and have, I believe, secured victory by that means. But it was not the right thing to do, and he only took the stand he did in favour of national schools when he found the influence of a certain church was brought to bear in favour of separate schools. In my opinion the govern-