

judged, and every public man is to be judged, by his own statement, made from his heart, and uttered from his lips; but I am not here to be judged by any suspicion, and by any parody, and by any misrepresentation that an opponent may make of that statement. The very moment that gentlemen in a representative assembly go off from the solid ground of taking the statement that a man actually made, and believing it, as they are bound to do, that moment they leave gentlemanly and parliamentary discussion, and appeal to a plane which is far lower and far more unworthy. These hon. gentlemen opposite talk about kaleidoscopic changes. I think I can see a kaleidoscope change on the other side of the House. I think that a spirit has come over the dreams of these hon. gentlemen now, as compared with a few days ago. I read their faces to-day, as I read them before. They are not so pleasant-looking. Their smiles are not so seductively alluring, and their cast of countenance is in quite a different mould. You would think, Sir, that between that day and this a funeral had occurred. Perhaps it is the funeral of the ill-starred, and too quickly begotten hopes that hon. gentlemen opposite formed a few days ago; a repetition of hopes that they have formed again and again, and buried in a mantle of disappointment. That is the hope that maybe, the Conservative party some time or other would be so foolish as to go to pieces by internal dissensions, and let them come into power. Sir, contrasting that period of two or three days ago with the period of to-day, and contrasting the varying facial expressions of the hon. gentlemen, the truth of the whole matter can be easily seen. A day or two ago they were hopeful that they would get into power, because they could creep through a chink in the Conservative ranks, but to-day they see the Conservative ranks solidly opposing them, and displaying a united front. The other day, Sir, tears were not hot enough nor copious enough to properly represent their feelings of heartfelt sympathy for the Bowell Government. To-day, Sir, their indignation and hot words of contempt are not strong enough to show their hatred of that same Bowell Government which they declare has not been strengthened by the addition of a single element. Take the false sympathy of these hon. gentlemen, and their equally false expressions of contempt that they do not, in their hearts, feel, and you have an unerring barometer which tells you the state of their political temperature. Now, I put it to the members of the House, and I put it to the people of the country who will read these debates, because the country is interested enough to read them, I ask if these gentlemen opposite have, in their discussion of the subject this afternoon touched the germ of the question in dispute during this critical period of the last

week. They have uttered their words of contempt, they have had their expressions of deep loathing, they have had these hoarded up for the last week to be delivered to the House. They have given us the pleasure of listening to some very good comic rehearsals by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), and some very good mock tragedy by my hon. friend (Mr. Davies). But, outside of that, where has there been a business-like or statesmanlike discussion of the issues involved so as to show where the members or the leaders of the Conservative party were wrong. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier), who started the discussion, gave, unfortunately (and I think not altogether to his own credit), a wrong trend to the discussion, by making a complete parody of the statement which was read by myself in the House a few days ago. Others followed him, and they ended up with the declaration that the statement which had been submitted, after having been presented to His Excellency, and read in this and the other House to-day, was completely subversive of, and contradictory to, the statement which was read previously. Here are the two statements, and both of them will be on the records of the House. I challenge any honest and reasonable man to read the two of them and not see that they entirely agree as to the main question which has been the central point of the differences that existed between the members of the Government. Leave aside, for a moment, all the misinterpretations, the inferences, the imaginations which have been founded upon, and drawn from, the first statement, and when you boil it down it means exactly this: That seven members of the Government, bound by their oath of office as Privy Councillors to give their best consideration to the public questions which come before them, without personal considerations of any kind, that these seven gentlemen came to the conclusion that, upon a certain point, there existed a sufficient reason for them to insist upon the strengthening and completion of the Government. No man can deny that. To-day, Sir, the statement which has been read here by my hon. colleague who represents the Premier and the Government in this House makes that the very kernel and gist of its meaning. It says, as plainly as the English language can put it, that between members of the Government there was a difference often discussed, as to the constitutional propriety as well as on the policy, not simply of meeting this House, but of coming to the transaction of the business of this House with a Government that was incomplete and not, therefore, as strong as it should be. Has one of the gentlemen opposite discussed the constitutional question as to whether or not this was sufficient ground to cause a difference of opinion leading to the result reached? Let us look at the facts of the case. When this House was in session last