

or where he is going to be, but, they do not both know it. One of them will probably get the office and we will then see a display of the anger of the one who has not got the position he desires. The right hon. First Minister says that it is only thirty-one days' delay, and he also said that in 1888 it was a matter of months or probably more that the position of Minister of the Interior was vacant. Does the right hon. gentleman want that to go to the country as the honest, statesmanlike utterance of the First Minister of the Dominion of Canada? But, if we have, as was said by hon. members on his own side of the House, and as is the fact, before us one of the most momentous questions that have at any time involved the consideration of this House, a question that will affect the future of the west, half a million miles of the best territory of this Dominion and the best agricultural country that exists to-day, is there any analogy between this case and the case of the Minister of the Interior in 1888? 'Only thirty-one days ago,' says the right hon. First Minister, and in a while when it suits my convenience, when I get entirely ready, after I have held at bay the office-seekers who want the position and whom I dare not now offend because I want to dangle before them the plums of office and not offend any one of them until after this crucial period has gone by, then, after the 1st of July, after I have riveted upon the west and established the system of fetters that I desire, then, at my convenience, as the great Czar of Canada—for the time being; not for all time to come, thank God,—I will announce what I will do. He says that he is embarrassed by a wealth of material. Very likely. The right hon. First Minister is perfectly sincere. He has a wealth of material in this House. One man says that he is as good as the other. Each man says: I am the big man for the situation; and this is a source of embarrassment perhaps to the right hon. First Minister. He dare not fill that position because he is afraid that some of his followers whose votes he depends upon might not be available in this crisis. I do not know that I need say much further in reference to what the right hon. First Minister has said. The right hon. gentleman is more remarkable for what he does not say on these occasions than for what he says. But, he asks: Would you expect us to have an election and to have this discussion going on at the same time? What does the right hon. gentleman mean by that? Does it require his personal supervision to engineer the election in the west? Does it require that the strength of the cabinet shall be transferred to the west or to any of the most important points of the west while an election is going on? Does the right hon. gentleman feel that the situation is so delicate and dangerous in the west that it will require all the power of the government,

and probably more to bring about the result that he wants? Does he anticipate now that when the 1st of July has gone past and when he does appoint a Minister of the Interior the people of the west will visit with condemnation the administration which is now in power at Ottawa? Or, does he simply mean that it will require so much manipulation that it would be impossible to carry on this discussion in the House and carry on an election in the west at the same time? What is the meaning of it? Is it an admission to the people of Canada (wrested from the right hon. First Minister) because we have not had such an admission made often in this House, that he realizes that it will take the most superhuman effort on his part to win in the west if he were to open a constituency there at the present time? In other words that he has not, with all the wealth of material that he has in this House or out of it, because he could select a minister for this position out of the House as well as in it—he could send Mr. Aylesworth up there if he could be elected,—the least chance of electing his Minister of the Interior if he will accept the challenge which is a fair and square challenge, to give to those people who have not been allowed to voice their opinions the opportunity of testing this question and of saying whether they want this measure proposed by the right hon. First Minister or not.

Now, I had intended to refer to another aspect of this case, but I find that I have got excited and that is not usual with me. I must excuse myself. I believe I am justified in asking for the indulgence of this House if I do get a little excited on this occasion. I believe as the right hon. minister says, that our passions on some of these occasions are not wholly ignoble, it is probably 'the exaggeration of a noble sentiment,' the right hon. minister says and perhaps there is a little exaggeration of noble sentiments from time to time as the debate goes on. I think that when we cannot get a solitary member representing the west on the government side of the House to stand up and advocate the rights of the west, when we cannot get the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who was an advocate of opinions which are in direct conflict with the proposition of the government to-day, when we cannot get that great democrat to rise up and say that in this day the people shall be supreme, when we cannot get back into the House that champion of national schools, the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), to speak one word on behalf of the great people of the west, a place which is to be the garden of Canada in the future and the grandest agricultural territory within this country,—when we cannot get these hon. gentlemen to stand up and say one word on behalf of the great people of the west, then, I feel that I am justified in having got a