

jealousy and envy of some other countries which also have lands to settle. We have no quarrel with anybody nor do we desire to have any. We rely on our own superiority and are satisfied to rely on that alone.

My hon. friend has referred to certain words which were made use of by my hon. friend the Postmaster General. I have only this observation to make in that connection. There is solidarity amongst all the members of the government. They must all conform to the one standard, but no one expects that all individual members of the government shall think identically upon all subjects. At least we do not expect it on this side. It may be that on the other side, all minds are built alike and cast in the same groove, but that is not the case with us. When however there is question of framing a policy for the government, that policy cannot be framed unless there is giving and taking among the different members. Liberals have more difficulty in drawing conclusions and framing policies than is experienced on the other side. The Tories have a happy faculty of following like sheep wherever they are led. But judging by my own experience as leader of the party on this side it is very difficult to get members of the government and the party generally to take that easy view that every man must follow blindly as he is led. We have greater difficulty in reconciling opinions, and there may be occasions when it is only after long effort a man will surrender his own views for the public good. Any other method of framing a policy and carrying it out cannot succeed with us. Our men are allowed to keep their own opinions, but they must submit to the view of the majority when it comes to be a question of adopting a general policy. My hon. friend the Postmaster General said nothing else when he referred to the vexed question of the indemnity and pensions. I had a conversation with my hon. colleague upon that question before he made the remarks which the hon. gentleman quoted, and I told him that my view was that the legislation we had adopted last year was perhaps susceptible of some revision and amendment. Not for the moment will I question the principle, but will reserve that for another occasion, but even admitting the principle of the pension adopted last year, it may be that in many respects the legislation may be improved upon. So far I agree with my hon. friend the Postmaster General. Let me add that I agree also completely with my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, upon this point namely, that it is better these matters should be threshed out manfully before the House. There is no excuse whatever for any hon. gentleman refraining from expressing his opinion when he has the opportunity of doing so and afterwards airing his grievances when it is too late for him to affect the action of parlia-

ment. But I have to take some issue with my hon. friend regarding some remarks he made on the admission of the Postmaster General into the cabinet. My hon. friend expressed his surprise that I had chosen the Postmaster General from abroad when I had the opportunity of making a selection from among the members of this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to lose my hon. friend (Sir William Mulock.) But when I lost his services, I thought we could do no better than call to the council of the nation such a man as my hon. friend, the present Postmaster General, (Mr. Aylesworth). It is true that there were at least twenty men on the floor of this House quite able to perform the duties of his office and continue the great work inaugurated by Sir William Mulock. But no doubt there is a difference between the Grits and Tories on this point. If my hon. friend had been in my place, he would have found a great scramble among his friends in the House for the position and he would have been beset on all sides by his supporters in parliament anxious to serve their country in a cabinet position. But that was not the case in the Liberal party. I was left perfectly free to act as I thought best in the interests of the country, and all the supporters of the government submitted at once and gracefully to the decision I took and the choice I made. All approved the choice and showed themselves ready to rally behind my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

* Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that we should take an intermission and laugh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a free country, and I shall not attempt to prevent my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) from laughing if he thinks this a laughing matter. He thinks it laughable that able men should submit to be passed over in favour of some other man. It is not the custom of my hon. friend so to read his duty—everybody knows it. And there was the reverse of laughing in those days.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to another subject—the insurance commission. He takes issue with the action of the government on this point. He thinks that we should have proceeded differently, that we should have consulted parliament. Sir, our action is before parliament. Let me say, first of all, that, if we have appointed that commission, it is because I believe that such wrong doing has taken place here as in the state of New York. I believe the Canadian Companies are unimpeachable; I believe they are honest, and that the investigation will show it. But, Sir, the insurance companies should be like the wife of Ceasar, they should be above suspicion. There is no doubt that there exists in the public mind a certain hesitance, a certain disposition to believe that