

of no Cabinet or government under the sun would have been free of the same charge; for in all cabinets and all governments differences of opinion will arise, which will be fought out to the end and will result in the resignations of those who feel that they cannot give in to the contentions that prevail in the Cabinet. Now, Sir, the great desire and the great aim, evinced the other day in this House by my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, persisted in to-day by some of his followers, spread throughout the country from one end to the other most sedulously, is to make it appear that there is a reason behind the reason; and that reason they read to be that there is a lack of unanimity in the Government on some vital questions of policy. I say again that the only basis you can have for argument amongst gentlemen and in a parliamentary assembly is to take the records and the statements and argue from them. And taking the records and the statements, can my hon. friend find warrant for an assertion of that kind? No, Sir, he cannot, but he is one of those gentlemen who will inquire in this way. If you make a statement that the sun rises at six o'clock in the morning and sets at six o'clock at night, he will take up that statement and read it, and then declare that although you said this, what you meant was that the sun rises at six at night and sets at six in the morning. In reply to that kind of misrepresentation you can have no argument. It may, however, be of some benefit to those in the country who hear of or read the hon. gentleman's statement, to place the truth just briefly before the House this afternoon. The hon. gentleman could find nothing better to do a moment ago than to rise and coolly assert that I had made no statement in this House or the country from which any intelligent man could find out my position on the Manitoba school question. He said that I had gone to Smith's Falls and said something there. So I did, and I will tell the hon. gentleman what I did say. But I will tell the hon. gentleman first what I said in this House last session, and if my hon. friend thinks himself unable to understand English, he may give other gentlemen credit for knowing what the English language means. I said this on July 8th of last year:

A session of the present Parliament will be called together to meet not later than the first Thursday of January next. If by that time, the Manitoba Government fails to make a satisfactory arrangement to remedy the grievances of the minority—

Does my honourable friend understand that?

—the Dominion Government will be prepared at the next session of Parliament, to be called as above stated—

To wit, as stated in the first line of the paragraph that I am reading—

--to introduce and press to a conclusion—

Is not that definite?

—such legislation as will afford an adequate relief to the said minority, based upon the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council and the remedial order of the 21st March, 1895.

It strikes me that that is tolerably plain, concise English. Mr. Foster was at Smith's Falls, said the hon. gentleman, and made a statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the statement that I made there, and from which, the hon. gentleman said, no man could gather at all what position I took upon this question. This is what I said:

I tell you, as one having authority to say it, that on that question of policy, as stated definitely by me in the House and by Sir Mackenzie Bowell in the Senate, every member of the Government sees eye to eye. Our opponents get up their fanciful narrations as to who is not and who is going to approve it.

I think I must have had the hon. gentleman from Charlottetown, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in my eye.

It is all simple imagination. Every one of the Government is united upon that just as closely as upon the trade question—that is, altogether and unanimously.

Here you have our position as a whole, as a Government, and on both these questions. Now, I appeal to fair-play, to the sense of what is right in this House and out of it, to know whether that is a statement which is clear and definite. And if my hon. friend wants more, I will read him another bit of fairly terse English. That is in the statement read by me the other night:

I may say, in the first place, that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the Premier upon any question of public policy, trade or constitutional, with regard to which action has been already taken, or in respect to which an attitude has been already assumed by the Government under the present Premier.

And yet, in the face of those consecutive statements, first, my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, and then those who follow him, find nothing better to do than make the assertion that the real reason is something else than what I give as the reason, and that there is no unity in the Cabinet on this question. My hon. friend thinks he has stated the whole case when he says that Ministers went about the country from place to place and declared that the Government was united while all the time they were disunited. Again my hon. friend will not state the facts. Let him read those statements. We stated that the Government were thoroughly united upon all the essential lines of its policy. And so it was. But I suppose it will be many and many generations before you will find a Cabinet, all the members of which agree with each other on all the different questions that come before it for discussion and