

the questions involved in this Bill. They hold their views honestly, and have a right to hold and to express them. And they have expressed their views frankly. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made one of the best speeches of the session in explaining his views on this question, though those views were not the same that I hold. Is he to be found fault with because he has honestly stated his position? Certainly not. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who offered this criticism, it seems to me, has not shown much courage in speaking out on this question. When the Bill was introduced with section 16, as it originally was, he made the statement:

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not spoken on the Bill yet.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, why should he find fault because some on this side have not spoken and say they lack courage?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not understand what my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) is talking about.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will read 'Hansard' to-morrow, he will find that he spoke of men on this side of the House as not having courage to speak out. He told them to come from behind the leader of the opposition and express themselves.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I did say something like that.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the country would have been better satisfied if the Minister of Justice himself had spoken on the measure. He has a great deal to do with this Bill:—And I am bound to say that hitherto the hon. gentleman has always handled legislation he had in charge in a manner to reflect credit upon himself and upon the government. But I think, he has been a little careless, perhaps, in not making a speech a little earlier that might have—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is there any chance of converting my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram)? If so, I will speak at the very next sitting of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. I am bound to say that there is not the slightest chance. Let me point out to the Minister of Justice the fact that clever lawyers on his own side have spoken on the Bill, but these clever lawyers

do not agree. If the Minister of Justice himself had stated first what these clauses did contain, we might have been saved some of the exhibitions we have had in this House in connection with the Bill, and perhaps we should not have had the slurring allusions which we have had from the ex-Minister of the Interior and others concerning the Minister of Justice.

Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjourn negatived.

#### PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden, thereto.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). I suppose at this late hour, one would hardly be expected to resume this debate. The debate of to-day has thrown considerable light on surrounding circumstances in connection with the Bill, and I think perhaps, if we have a chance of digesting what has been said to-day, it may shorten the remarks of to-morrow. I would therefore ask the hon. the Prime Minister to allow me to again move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BARKER. Before the House adjourns, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that on Friday last he said he would look into the question as to whether or not there was any correspondence with the government of Ontario as to the extension of the boundaries of that province. It was said that there was correspondence of the late government of Hon. G. W. Ross and his colleagues.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the boundaries of Manitoba and Ontario?

Mr. BARKER. In regard to any extension of Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, there has been no correspondence.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.05 a.m., Friday.