

large degree he rested upon the forbearance of the House and the good-will of the supporters of the Administration, has seen proper to attack the Prime Minister for incapacity in the discharge of public business, and to declare, in effect, that the failures of the Conservative party in the country have been due to that incapacity. Sir, under the constitution of ancient Abyssinia—

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, give us a rest.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, I will interest the hon. gentleman. Under the constitution of ancient Abyssinia there was a council known as the Sacred Council, which claimed the right, when they were tired of the sovereign, to pass an order directing him to die, and he was supposed to obey that order. Ultimately, there was a sovereign in Abyssinia who refused to die, and who ordered his guards to execute the order of the Sacred Council upon that honourable body; and if the Prime Minister should adopt that policy towards these hon. gentlemen, perhaps there would not be a great deal of sympathy for them or a great deal of regret in consequence. There might have been a more effective way than the one which the hon. gentlemen have adopted. In the East there are more recent constitutions than that of Abyssinia. There is at Stamboul a practice, I believe, which the hon. gentlemen might have imitated here. There are surely bowstrings and bags in Ottawa as well as at Stamboul, and the waters behind Parliament Hill are as deep as those in the Bosphorous, so that the hon. gentlemen might perhaps have got rid of their Premier, if they wished to deal unfairly with him, without making the matter so notorious, not merely in this House, but in every part of the country. What is the defence that the late Minister of Finance has made of this attempt to take the life of the Premier? We took him, says the hon. gentleman, with a good deal of misgiving. We took him for better or for worse, and we find him worse than we took him for. That is the position which the hon. gentleman has taken, that is the defence he has made for the course which he and his six colleagues have adopted towards the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman says: We have not lost confidence in the policy of the Conservative party. He says that policy is a healthy policy, one that commends itself to the Liberal-Conservative party, and that, under the leadership of a competent man, that party could return from the country triumphant. The hon. gentleman has great faith. Now, it was under the lead of the hon. gentleman himself, rather than under the lead of the Premier, that certain bye-elections were held. A number of constituencies represented by supporters of the Government in this House had become vacant. There was Antigonish, which was lost to the Administra-

tion. There is Centre Montreal which is lost to the Administration. There is the seat of Jacques Cartier which is lost to the Administration. And the hon. gentleman was afraid for some time to create a vacancy in Cardwell, although an office was promised to the former member for Cardwell some time ago. He was afraid that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would be tempted to tread on the tails of the Government's coat, and so Mr. White was not appointed to office and the seat did not become vacant until Mr. White forced the hands of the Government by resigning. The seat then did become vacant, and the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) did tread on the tails of the Government coat with a very great deal of success. The hon. gentleman who used to lead this House (Mr. Foster)—and not the Premier—went into that constituency and the other vacant constituencies and defended the course of the Government, and dilated on the ability of the Government, and waxed eloquent on the masterly manner in which the affairs of this country were being administered by the Government; but notwithstanding his representations in Cardwell, and in the other constituencies where seats held by the Government became vacant, these constituencies were lost to the Administration. Therefore, I say, it exhibits a great deal of faith on the part of the late Finance Minister for him to declare now to this House that the Liberal-Conservative party is quite sure of success in the country if it only had a competent man at its head. Why, the hon. gentleman's statement that the country is in a sound and healthy and contented condition is not justified by the results of the elections. He must see that these results point in a wholly different direction. I would like to know who is responsible for this discontent in the country. Has the late Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), or the late Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague), or the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart), or any of the other gentlemen who have retired from the Government, no responsibility in the discharge of the duties of governing? If there has been inefficiency on the part of the Government, if there is dissatisfaction in the country, whose inefficiency is it that has created that dissatisfaction? Is the Prime Minister alone responsible for the feeling which exists in the country? No, Sir. There is no one who has contributed more to create an unfavourable impression with regard to the conduct of public affairs than the late Finance Minister himself. These dead branches that were to be lopped off are still upon the Government tree. Those that were cut off have been grafted on again, and the country has not had that relief from the reforms which the hon. gentleman had promised. Let me read to the House a few of the paragraphs contained in this address which the hon. gentleman