

may justify him in refusing to swallow again.

The truth about Mr. Sifton's resignation and the situation here for ten days past is told as nearly in the Leader dispatches—which I did not send, but had cognizance of—as can be told. I do not believe—

Now, this is rich.

I do not believe that Laurier or any member of the cabinet, beyond Scott and Fitzpatrick, thought other than that section 16 of the Bill simply provided to continue existing conditions. We Northwest members advised this provision—

What provision? 'The continuation of existing conditions.'

And we were told that our advice would be followed.

And so 'none but Scott and Fitzpatrick;' these were the sinners, the one with white locks in the Senate and the other with curly black locks in the House. These were the two men who knew the inwardness of that clause 16 and who imposed upon their unsuspecting colleagues in the cabinet and their equally unsuspecting colleagues from the Northwest. But there was misgiving.

Laurier's speech indicated nothing further to me—and I followed him closely—even in face of the fact that the reference to revenues and school lands funds made me nervous as furnishing a handle for suspicion.

Scott and Fitzpatrick had walled them up against the Red Sea.

But the one saviour was near. The oft-heralded, the swift-flying saviour, coming from the hot springs in the centre of the far west, arrived in time to let these poor benighted cabinet ministers, and these equally benighted followers from the Northwest loose from the clutches of Scott and Fitzpatrick. Who was it?

Sifton's analyzing acumen quickly picked out the meaning of the clause which, without question would remove the separate schools from public regulation. I am convinced myself that if Sifton had been a man keen to remain in public life he could have had the thing changed without resigning, but he contends the opposite. The difficulty since found in obtaining modification seems to justify him, but, on the other hand, it is quite possible his action aroused a resentment which would not have been such a factor otherwise.

There you have the veritable Walter Scott, beleaguered by the arch plotters Fitzpatrick and Scott—fighting in vain against the enslaving clause and saved at last by Sifton.

What a different face he puts on in this House. Philip drunk or Philip sober—which?

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister finds no denunciation too strong to hurl at Mr. Haultain for standing up against that clause 16. His own trusted lieutenant, the man whom he chose—say what he likes—to lead the fight and carry the province in favour of his pet

Mr. FOSTER.

project saw the very same danger that Mr. Haultain saw, and he 'swallowed,' whilst Mr. Haultain stood to his principles and his convictions. Now, it is a perilous thing for this country when the Prime Minister makes the statement or maintains the proposition that the lieutenant governor or the director of the lieutenant governor shall refuse to call a man to form a cabinet because he does not accept in a party sense or in any other sense, his own private view. And that was the sin of Mr. Haultain, and for it he must be passed over. He believed that the constitution was violated, that the British North America Act was being stretched beyond its true intent. As a loyal subject he declared his determination to see to it that that was decided by the highest court in the land, and for that action his long years of experience, the trust of his people in him, all these things which would have caused him to be selected, were swept aside and a gentleman who had had no experience and had no mandate from the Northwest was chosen to take his place and to inaugurate the machinery for the election. And what else took place? Before the elections were brought on the constituencies were made to order and made for a purpose. The premier was made to order, and made for a purpose. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) went to the Northwest to order, and he went there for a purpose. The whole machinery of the official life of the country was directed to the work; and that was done for a purpose; and from the beginning to the end it worked ruthlessly, shamelessly, outrageously, even to the violation of the most sacred right of the citizen, the right to deposit his ballot and to be represented in the councils of his country, even to the dragging of the courts into the dispute and placing them upon the side of the robbery of ballots and defiance of the people's rights. From the beginning to the end—that base and sordid end—the same spirit and impulse is to be noted. From the Prime Minister at the first to the ballot thief at the last, all are links in the same chain, joined together for the accomplishment of the same purpose.

Sir, the Prime Minister is not here. But I think that, as he was walking home to-night and thinking over what he had said here this afternoon, he must have admitted to himself that he was a most consummate 'jollier.' Do not I know, do not you know, Mr. Speaker, do not we all know, that he attempted no serious answer to the positions which were urged with such force by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition? All very nice as a jollier, but for a constitutional ruler, the head of a great party, the head of a so-called Liberal party, to treat these matters in that way was not serious, was not in keeping, I hardly dare to say that it was not becoming, but it does put itself, to my mind, in that way. He excused the Minister of Agriculture on what ground? Now, the right hon. gentle-