

minister, with regard to the crisis in the affairs of the administration. We listened with great interest to his statement, which was full and was also satisfactory, particularly the last few words which were misapprehended by the hon. gentleman from de Lanaudière. Now, I feel that all we had in view to-day was to hear the remarks of the Premier and any observations which might naturally arise out of his explanation; but here we are discussing the merits of the attitude taken by the province of Manitoba in a manner which might be fitting enough if we were considering the remedial legislation which may, or may not, be laid before parliament. I think this is very much to be regretted. The hon. gentleman who leads the opposition in this House is sometimes, just a little too much of the dove and too little of the serpent. The hon. gentleman who sits opposite is not nearly so much of the dove and is very much of the serpent. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Scott) in remarking upon the reasons for their action given by the gentlemen who have recently left the administration, stated that he thought that the reason given in another place by the ex-Minister of Finance for the action of these gentlemen was not the true reason, and he indicated what he thought the real reason was. I felt at the time that the hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Scott) went perhaps a little further than was necessary, when he said that in his opinion the curing of the evils suffered by the minority in Manitoba, by means of remedial legislation, was hopeless; but in reply to the question of the hon. gentleman from Mille Isles the hon. leader of the opposition stated that he was simply giving his own individual opinion and did not speak for his party. Under the circumstances, I think it was exceedingly ungenerous, not to say, contrary to parliamentary etiquette, for the hon. gentleman who holds the position of Minister of Agriculture to attack the whole of the opposition and to credit the leader of the liberal party with all the difficulties which have arisen in connection with the matter of the Manitoba separate schools, with which the leader of the opposition has never had anything to do. The hon. gentleman who leads the opposition in another place, has from session to session carefully avoided interfering in the matter. He has said to the government and very properly, that it is not the duty

of the leader of the opposition to formulate a policy for the government upon any question, and he has told the government further that when they introduce their measure he will define his position. It will be time enough, when the measure has been introduced and the leader of the opposition has taken his stand with regard to it, for the Minister of Agriculture and other gentlemen to discuss and criticise his attitude. As far as I know, the observations made on the platform and elsewhere by the leader of the opposition have given the impression that if the government introduce a remedial measure intended for the relief of the minority in the province of Manitoba, that measure will have his support. I presume it will also have the support of a large portion, at any rate, of his followers. One cannot tell how the liberal party will act in the matter, any more than one can predict how the followers of the Premier will vote. I fancy that when the measure which is promised is introduced—if it ever is introduced—it will be found that there will be among the followers of both gentlemen more or less of what may be called "go as you please." I repeat that it is very much to be regretted that there should be a premature discussion of this very important question without any notice being given or time for preparation afforded. At the proper time the question can be discussed intelligently, and no doubt each member of both Houses will have an opportunity of placing himself on record and of making his position clear both to parliament and to the country.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is in favour of the policy of the leader of his party in the other House?

Hon. Mr. POWER—What is the policy? I wish to see the government measure first. When that measure has been introduced and the leader of the opposition has taken a position with respect to it, I shall be better able to answer the question.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I have heard of the ability of an Irishman to give an evasive answer and this is certainly a good example. My question was direct. Does the hon. gentleman from Halifax favour the policy laid down by his leader?