

Mr. BENNETT. We all know that certain influences were at work in the province of Quebec in the last election; there was the pledge that there should be separate schools in the Northwest, and I have no doubt that was worked to the bitter end; quietly no doubt; much quieter than in the case of the Remedial Bill in 1896. Be that as it may, here is a cabinet disjointed and disrupted, paralyzed before the people of Canada for the last three weeks, fighting within and fears without, and its supporters all muzzled except the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy), whom I congratulate on his bravery in standing up in defiance of the government, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who has not been seen since. My fear is that if any other gentleman on that side were to make a similar statement, the same fate might attend him. And what is the position of the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) to-day? Here is the Bill which he was to support going to be emasculated, nothing to be left of it, and if the hon. gentleman comes back to the House he will have to denounce the government for taking the very vitals out of his pet measure. And where is the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott)? He published in the newspapers that he was favourable to this legislation, but to-night he is as silent as the tomb. What a humiliating spectacle! Only the Prime Minister to speak, and after him the Minister of Justice; and when the Minister of Justice has had his say, it is the same parade of the stock in trade that brought the Prime Minister to the front in the province of Quebec, and on which he has been depending ever since, and on which he must always depend in order to have a political existence in this country.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). If this House can congratulate itself that during the discussions of this measure inflammatory addresses have been unknown in the past, we have now to regret that such a happy condition of affairs has come to an end. It has remained for another member of the silent ministry to drag in that passion, that prejudice and that extreme asperity and bitterness which hon. members on this side of the House have been most anxious to exclude. In reply to the repeated demands from this side of the House that some one should speak for the government, the Minister of Justice flew to his feet and indulged in the most extreme degree of heat and passion. I would remind the hon. minister that there is a time to be bitter, as there is a time to be tranquil. If, in the bitterness of his soul, the Minister of Justice is forced to rise up and denounce the engendering of passion and prejudice where passion and prejudice did not exist, I must refer him to his leader, the Prime Minister, for the ground upon which passion and prejudice is fostered. Eating dead sea fruit is bitter work, and the bit-

terness of the eating lies with the Minister of Justice to-day, and it is made more bitter because the bitterness of it is thrust down his throat by the leader of the government. The hon. gentleman has appealed to the verdict of the people in 1896. Will he stand by the verdict of the people in 1896? Is he content to take that verdict upon the principles involved in this question? But, Sir, it is the verdict of the people of to-day that is wanting, and that verdict we have not by reason of the fact that this measure was not submitted to the people, but was kept in the back ground when the government made their appeal at the last general election. The Minister of Justice has told us that in pursuing the course which he has pursued, the Prime Minister has not lost the respect of a single person whose respect he values. Contrast that with the statement of the Prime Minister, who said he accepted with sorrow and regret the resignation of his Minister of the Interior, and you will see in it a direct contradiction of the statement of the Minister of Justice.

The right hon. gentleman said, in accepting the resignation of the hon. Minister of the Interior, on the first day of the month, that he had regret in accepting it—that there were no causes of difference between them beyond the cause of difference set forth in the correspondence. Yet, the hon. Minister of Justice would have this House believe that the right hon. gentleman did not care for the support of the hon. Minister of the Interior, and therefore he dismissed him and sent him from the cabinet doors. There is a position of inconsistency, Sir, which it is hard to reconcile. But when we talk of inflammatory addresses, let us see the extraordinary position in which this cabinet finds itself to-day. Upon this important question, which has occupied more or less off and on the attention of this House since the 21st day of February last, when the Bill was introduced by the Prime Minister, what intimation have we had from the members of the ministry of their individual views pro or con? Although challenges have been issued from this side of the House, they have not met with any response except from the right hon. gentleman who has posed as the Czar of this measure. Yes, they have. Through these weary days of waiting, we have heard from the hon. Minister of the Interior, and the moment he spoke he condemned the measure; and when after further weary days of waiting, enlivened possibly by the eloquence the mental vision and the mental dexterity with which the right hon. gentleman evaded the appeals to him from this side of the House to explain, we have at last, at long last, Sir, been favoured with an expression of opinion by the hon. Minister of Justice. Sir, from all that rumour has brought to our ears, some