

upon a clause to the principle of which he still declares he is opposed, and to which his whole record is opposed?

Well, Sir, we have seen things. We have seen in this government three of its ablest ministers go out in the prime and vigour of their years. One, the former Minister of Railways and Canals, heralded, lauded, declared to be the strong man of the government, took a stand upon principle upon a certain most important measure and handed in his resignation as a protest because he believed that the measure which was introduced would be a measure fraught with incalculable injury to his country and he could not give his assent to it. The only logical course for a man who did that was to see that a measure so fraught with evil was fought to its latest and did not become part of the statutes of this country. But, Sir, the Prime Minister knows a thing or two. He approached the Minister of Railways and Canals, pistol in one hand, soporific in the other. It is not on record, because these negotiations were verbal largely, as to whether the trigger of the pistol was pulled or not, but it is on record that the soporific was taken and taken effectually. With a fine disregard of the principles of the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) that public offices and public emoluments should not be used for purely and solely party interests the right hon. First Minister used the money and public offices of this country as a soporific to lull for the time being and until his purposes were accomplished the dissent and protest of one of his strongest ministers. To-day he meets his former Minister of the Interior, pistol in one hand and soporific in the other. Here again the communications are verbal, there is no written record, we do not know whether the pistol had to be drawn positively or not, and we do not know yet what the soporific is, but it is to be powerful and effective. One other minister remained, not by any means the least strong or the least active. On what principle he went out, or assumed to go out, I do not quite know nor do I quite know how he views it. The pistol was evidently applied but whether there is a compensating soporific yet to come or not we shall have to wait for time to reveal. Let me hope and express some confidence in the hope that out of the three there will be at least one minister who will have the manliness to stand firm, and having gone out on principle will stay out on principle.

Now, Sir, having got that far, let me put a question to the Northwest members who are supporting the government in this House. They were like sheep without a shepherd. Their shepherd was sporting peacefully and pastorally in the far off southern hills and his sheep here were without an efficient shepherd, without what we call the leading one—I will not say the leading sheep, it is only a simile anyway. While

the leading one was away the others unled fell into an artful design, a trap, laid—shall I say by the hon. Minister of Justice?—No, not perhaps laid, but that facility of verbiage, that *savoir faire* way of putting a thing so that it shall be preserved and yet not seen was too much for the members from the Northwest in the absence of their lynx-eyed, keen and well informed leader. They all fell into the pit, they groaned in the pit and tumbled about in the pit until their leader came back and gently led them by paths out of the wilderness back to firmer and higher ground. But, for ever and for ever, say what you may, or think what you may, to the seven members from the Northwest who were conferred with, who gave their advice to help to formulate this Bill, who knew what was in it—for ever and for ever have they to bear the onus either of ignorance of what was in the Bill, or of indifference as to what was in it or of complicity in what the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior declared was the purpose of the clause. Now, this ought to give food for thought not only to the people of the Northwest but to the people of this country through and through. Then, I put this question to the right hon. Prime Minister: If, before the last election, he had made known his intention to develop two provinces out of the Territories and in giving them autonomy to withhold from them the power over their lands and the unlimited power to control their educational interests, how many men would he have had back here from the Northwest? I ask the right hon. gentleman what would have been his status in this country to-day? Is it to his credit that he kept back from the people that information or even an intimation of it and secured a following absolutely unpledged and without a mandate on this subject? My hon. friend knows that there is only one answer to that. I will put another question to him. If the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior had stood out on his principle as he called it, would one single member from the Northwest have dared to go against him? If he had stood out and if the rest had stood out with him would the right hon. leader of the government have dared to have attempted to put through his Bill? That is the question. Therefore, there was an incentive and a motive either for the use of the pistol or the soporific. One or the other has been used undoubtedly as no man would have repudiated his principles and the record of a lifetime on a most grave question, unless there had been some further inducement than the ex-Minister of the Interior declared before us here the other day.

Now, sir, let us go a little further. We heard yesterday an interesting speech from the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa). I do not propose to undertake the ungracious task of criticising that speech as every speech, the Prime Minister's and my