

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It had to do with sending Major Walsh there as the best man to be selected, and he was sent there because he was familiar with the North-west and a man of energy and good judgment, in whom we could place confidence, and he was sent there with general powers to represent the government of Canada in its executive capacity, having under him the control of the North-west mounted police.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—Did he go there with any instructions, or had he a roving commission to do as he pleased?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I am not here to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—You are here to answer questions put to you, when they are asked in the interest of the people of this country. That is what I consider you are here for, and not to make speeches and endeavour to get away from the question. It seems to me the government must have instructed him or given him a roving commission to go and govern that country and do just as he pleased. I do not think they would so far forget themselves as to give Major Walsh a roving commission. We all approve of Major Walsh. I believe he stands well amongst the people of this country and they have every confidence in him, but I cannot think that they sent him away without giving him instructions as to what to do. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman one would think they sent him with a roving commission to do just as he pleased.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Nothing of the kind.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—Certainly, they must have instructed him, and there may be something in the instructions that the minister might say it would not be prudent to tell. That is all right. But either they instructed him or they did not instruct him. If they instructed him the instructions should be laid on the table; if not, they have given him a roving commission to go and do as he pleased.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No, of course not. My hon. friend knows that when Major Walsh goes there, he goes to act under the law and in accordance with the law; we could not protect him if we instructed him

to violate the law, and that we have not done. My hon. friend knows, as my colleague has told him, that Major Walsh went there for the purpose of maintaining law and order. He went there at a critical period, when the city of Dawson was claimed to be within the United States Territory.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that that is the reason, surely.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I mean to say that is one of the reasons for sending him there. I mean to say, further than that, they claimed the territory of Bennett Lake and established a municipality there, and we sent our police force to a point to the south of Bennett Lake to maintain our authority, and we wanted a prudent man, a man who would make no mistake, in whose judgment we had confidence, and upon whose judgment we were called upon to rely. Under the circumstances we did what was best in the case, and what has happened so far has shown that it was best. There has been no disorder, there has been no complaint. Our authority has been maintained and that authority has been respected. I think that is the best vindication of the wisdom of the choice we made, and I have no doubt that the judgment of this House and the country will approve of what we have done.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Assuming for a moment that my hon. friend is correct in the statement that the United States claim Dawson, and possibly were in possession of it, I presume my hon. friend will admit that the instructions to Major Walsh would be to take Dawson.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. minister has excelled altogether the Secretary of State in his attempt to answer a question. The hon. gentleman tells us that Major Walsh was sent 'out there because the United States government claimed Dawson.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise to a point of order. There is nothing before the House and the discussion seems interminable.

Hon. Sir JOHN CARLING—I move that the House do now adjourn.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Before the motion is put to the House I