

the lower provinces of this Dominion. I will say no more on this point. No doubt my hon. friends from my sister province of Nova Scotia—the hon. gentleman did not include my province in his remarks—will take him to task for the remarks he has made. I do not wish to protract the discussion. As a member of the Conservative party who believes in the party, in its history, traditions and policy, I think the Conservative party of this country has reason to congratulate itself on the strength of the Cabinet announced to-day. In the first place, we have as a member of that Cabinet an honourable representative of Montreal in the Senate, a gentleman of position in his province, a man who has occupied positions of the highest honour at the hands of the people, and who is a gentleman of the very highest character. In the second place I think it is an immense advantage to the Government and the party, and it will prove of advantage to the country, to have in the Cabinet a gentleman of the strong personality, the great ability and the thoroughly loyal Canadian patriotism of Sir Charles Tupper, who has consented to take a place in the Administration, and in a few days will occupy a seat on the floor of this House. I believe his appointment will be received with applause and approbation not only in the province of Nova Scotia where he is known and honoured as one of the greatest of our public men, not only in New Brunswick and in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where his name is received with plaudits as a man who has done so much in the past to build up their industries, but also on the prairies of the west and in the province of British Columbia will his name be held in respect and prove a tower of strength, being that of a man who was one of the main instruments in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. And not only in Canada, and in every part of this Dominion, but in the great British Empire, in Great Britain itself, where there is no colonial statesman better known or more respected, his appointment to a seat in the Cabinet of Canada will be as heartily welcomed as in this country, and will have the greatest effect in helping to advance the welfare of this Dominion and strengthen its credit at the present time.

Mr. MULLOCK. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, the explanation that the Finance Minister has offered to the House and the country this afternoon of the unprecedented event that happened on 4th January inst., was that a vacancy occurred in the Cabinet in the month of July last and continued until the assembling of Parliament this month. That is the reason assigned in the paper read to-day, and that is the reason as endorsed by the speech of the Finance Minister. Now, if that is the case I venture to question the bona fides of that statement in the light of the evidence furnished in the House, and before the Finance Minister leaves

Mr. HAZEN.

the House I would like to ask him a question and will give him the floor for a brief moment if he wishes to reply. Will he explain to the House and to the country, why, that vacancy having existed from the 8th day of July, he and his colleagues did not resign sooner. I ask him why they postponed their resignations until the Address was prepared and placed in the hands of His Excellency; why they selected Saturday the 4th day of January, and I ask him further whether there was not a combination? Did he notify the First Minister at any time between the resignation of Mr. Angers and the assembling of Parliament, that he and his friends would take such a course if that vacancy were not filled? I pause for a reply. Mr. Speaker, the country is entitled to a fuller statement and a fuller explanation. The Finance Minister has heard my question but he remains silent. He cannot answer the question. I will take the hon. gentleman at his own word for a moment. He told us that they resigned on the 4th day of January because the Cabinet was incomplete. But the Cabinet had been incomplete since the previous July, and I ask, would it not have been his duty as an honourable man to have notified the Premier before the assembling of Parliament as to what he and the other six Ministers intended to do. Sir, we are told now that the whole cause of the strike has been removed by the filling of that one vacant portfolio. The country has not drawn that conclusion, nor has Parliament drawn such a conclusion. The press of the country has not drawn that conclusion, and I venture to say that when we go before the country, as I trust we shall in the near future, the electorate will not draw that conclusion. The question as to whether Ministers may embarrass a Cabinet is one thing, but it is a question now whether the conduct of Her Majesty's advisers will be condoned if it be established to the satisfaction of the public that one member of the Cabinet speaking for them all, has stated on the floor of Parliament for the information of the public a matter that is not true. Is the Cabinet bound to be frank and candid with the country, or is it to be allowed to adopt deception, concealment, and misrepresentation? What is the issue? It is contended that there was a deep laid plan to depose the First Minister and to appoint in his place Sir Charles Tupper, Sr. The Finance Minister tells us to-day that such is not a fact, and that the sole object of the strike was to cause a Cabinet vacancy to be filled in a constitutional way. The First Minister did not draw such a conclusion from the conduct of his confrères. He tells us, that he learned that their object was to strike at him. Speaking in the Upper Chamber last Thursday, the First Minister said in most unmistakable language, that the inference he drew from the paper read in the House, was that it was an attempt to strike at him,