

came. Mr. Forget could not have followed any other course than that which he followed. I have only to recall the facts which are familiar to all, to justify my statement that Mr. Forget could not have followed any other course in calling for an adviser to aid him in carrying out the government of that province. Mr. hon. friend (Mr. Borden) spoke of the attitude taken by Mr. Haultain when he was summoned to this House to help us in framing the constitution of the new provinces. I give all credit to Mr. Haultain for having assisted us and for having gone on with us so far as we were disposed to go on with him. But every one knows that as soon as a question arose as to which we could not agree with Mr. Haultain, and as to which we had to take issue with him, from that very moment Mr. Haultain ceased to give us his views and the benefit of his opinions, and from that moment he became an intense partisan. Everybody knows that Mr. Haultain thought fit—I am not questioning his motives—to take part in the struggle during last session in the by-elections in London and North Oxford. And every one knows also, that the language he made use of in both constituencies left no doubt at all that if he had the power he would do everything he could to destroy the constitution which we have given to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Under these circumstances why should the lieutenant governor call to his counsels as his chief adviser a man who, instead of being in sympathy with the constitution which had been given to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, was openly avowing his intention of putting a ruthless hand upon it? Under such circumstances the lieutenant governor would have been worse than a criminal—I do not hesitate to use the word—if he had not called to his counsels somebody who was disposed to have everything in the new province made as harmonious as possible. It was his duty to see that there was harmony in the land, and not discord; and therefore the lieutenant governor, though he was a friend of Mr. Haultain of many years' standing, could not do otherwise than to call to his counsels a man who would advise him to work the constitution harmoniously for the benefit of all. The response of the people has been the best justification of the action of Mr. Forget. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that as a constitutional governor he is not limited in any way in his choice. There is only one limit upon his choice, he can choose whom he pleases provided his choice is endorsed by the people of the province. He was subject to no other restriction, as my hon. friend knows as well as I do, because he does not charge against Mr. Forget that he has done anything unconstitutional, but something which was not generous or fair. Well, Sir, I leave it to the members of this House to say

whether Mr. Forget should have been so generous as to call an enemy of the constitution instead of a friend of the constitution.

Then, my hon. friend thought it advisable to cast some slurs upon the verdict of the people. True it is, there were twenty-four or twenty-five elections, in which I think seventeen members were returned as supporters of Mr. Scott; and it turns out that in one of these elections there was some fraud committed, and that one of the returning officers who were guilty of this fraud was an officer of this government. He was dismissed; but my hon. friend is not satisfied with that, and says he should have been prosecuted. My hon. friend knows as well as I do, and he acknowledges it, that it is not the duty of this government to prosecute offenders, that we are not charged with the administration of the law, but that this duty devolves upon the province. Therefore, if there has been an offence committed, whether the offender is an officer of this government or an ordinary citizen, he is to be prosecuted not by us but by the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan. My hon. friend said, however, that because he was one of our officers we should have prosecuted him, and he recalled some instances in which he alleged we had been negligent of our duty. Why did not my hon. friend refer also to the fact that during the last election, which took place in the month of November, 1904, when it was brought to our attention that certain offences had been committed against the electoral law and against the rights of the people, we did not hesitate to prosecute and to appoint counsel to look after the prosecutions? The gentleman who was appointed for that purpose was Mr. Shepley, to whom my hon. friend has just alluded. When frauds were proved to have been committed in Lanark and Frontenac, the guilty parties were not brought to justice, and officers were appointed by this government to see that the law was observed. But the elections which took place in the Northwest were not our elections, but provincial elections. Had they been elections of ours, we might have thought it proper to have appointed counsel to look after the observance of the law.

My hon. friend has also referred to the fact that in the electoral division of St. James some frauds were committed, and that one of the offenders who was brought to justice and convicted was afterwards released. For my part, I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has brought that matter again to the attention of the House. It will teach us the lesson henceforth that when petitions are brought to us for the release of prisoners we should scan very carefully the names on these petitions, so as to make sure that there are not among them the names of any of the prominent friends of my hon. friend. Perhaps my