

Party, as there was on this occasion. Without a question King got Woodsworth to move the amendment he did, and, no doubt at all frayed the Woodsworth amendment. However, that cannot be asserted as a matter of history. A Motion, however, in the form of an amendment is made to Parliament, which eliminates the element of censure on the Government itself from the main Motion. The Prime Minister announces his Government's support of this amendment. The amendment then goes to a vote and is defeated. There could be no more direct defeat than that. If the fact that someone else, and not a member of the Government, moved the amendment absolves the Government from the penalty, then no dangerous Motions would ever be made by a member of a Government.

Page 153:—Referring to the last paragraph—if the King Government was not in difficulties, and if its Parliamentary position was secure, and if, as King afterwards boasted, he enjoyed fully the confidence of the House, then why did he ask for dissolution? It is amazing the glorious abandon with which that man could lie!

Page 181:—It occurred to me as I read this page that another point might have been advanced, viz., that the electorate was entitled as well to the judgment of Parliament on the issue.

Page 207:—I do not quite understand why you have included "Lord Byng's refusal" as being without precedent.

Page 243:—You do bring out the point, but I would have liked to have seen it more strongly emphasised, that the very nature of the Resolution passed by Parliament against us put it out of the power of Parliament itself and of all those Members who supported the Resolution, to complain about our declining to perform any subsequent act of Government. According to the terms of this Resolution, not only had we no right to transact any business in Parliament, but we had no right to transact any business anywhere as a Government. Of course, King's talk about what we should have done and what he intended to do in the event of his having obtained dissolution, is the most blatant and transparent hypocrisy.

You have brought out with a clearness that I never appreciated before the scandalous conduct of King in walking out of office and leaving the country without a Government. I did not expose this rude and petulant conduct at the time as I should have done. No doubt it would be unprecedented. One could not conceive of any public man with a sense of decency doing such a thing. He added to the boorishness of his conduct by refusing to confer with me as to finishing the work of the Session.