

compulsion—children could leave if they desired to do so. Special provision was made to avoid interference with the conscience of any who were not content to receive such instruction. My hon. friend imported into his controversy something which I was going to say was not in good taste—perhaps that is going a little too far—but it certainly did not comport with my notions of parliamentary etiquette. He brought up the question which has been before the court, of the suit between Mr. Scott, premier of Saskatchewan, and Mr. McInnes, and he read a letter that was produced from Mr. Scott. I quote from a gentleman who was for many years the colleague of the leader of the opposition, and who was counsel for Mr. McInnes in this suit—the Hon. Mr. Daly. Mr. Daly condemned most emphatically the conduct of his own client. I will read what he said from the report of the trial :

Mr. Daly began his speech to the jury. He spoke slightly over an hour and undoubtedly made the best of the case he had, although he was guilty in one instance of deliberately misstating the evidence given by Mr. Scott. Mr. Daly said he had no excuse to offer or defence to make of the conduct of J. K. McInnes in publishing private and confidential letters.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That does not make their contents any the less true.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Nor had he any defence for Mr. Tom McInnes for having eavesdropped and spied upon his own father.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I am reading from a report, 'McInnes Found Guilty of Criminal Libel.'

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—What paper?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The Manitoba 'Free Press.'

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Does my hon. friend believe that that is a correct report?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think so. I have faith enough in the public press for that. They could have no motive whatever in wilfully misstating the facts, it would be sure to be corrected the next day.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I read that statement as coming from Mr. Howe!—I am not vouching for its truth—I read the statement as coming from Mr. Howell,

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

who was defending Mr. Scott, in which he accused the son of McInnes of being an eavesdropper, and spoke of him in the most contemptuous manner.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman, by way of trying to throw discredit on the statements made by the hon. gentleman from Lethbridge (Hon. Mr. DeVeber) who has been for eight years a member of the local legislature, as to the satisfaction with which the people received the inauguration of the new provinces—

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Do not misquote me. I threw no discredit upon his statements. I merely quoted his own language, and asked if he had such a perfect law, what necessity was there for the government interfering with it.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman, by way of explaining the majority which was obtained for the government in the west, introduced the question of ballot-boxes. Now there were fifty constituencies, and in only one was an attempt made to perpetrate fraud. The gentleman who received the majority vote in that constituency declined to take the seat; but because there was one fraud in fifty elections, the hon. gentleman denounces the whole fifty seats practically as having been corruptly obtained, whereas in Alberta there were twenty-three seats for the government. Thirty days went by, and not a single protest was entered. Does any one believe that if there had been the opportunity to set aside even one of the elections, resort would not have been had to the courts. The very fact that the whole twenty-three seats were allowed to go unprotested is the best evidence that there was no general fraud, no general desire to evade the election law of the country. No charges were made of any sort and the inference is that the election was fairly and honestly carried on. I do not choose to go back in the past history of this country, or I might bring up elections in years gone by, but I am not going to do anything of the kind. There are men connected with both political parties who disgrace the party with which they profess to be allied. The hon. gentleman quoted an instance in his own neighbourhood in which the ballot-boxes were interfered with. What did the