

like to repeat it if he had the opportunity, and we found then there was a depth a little lower than we had previously supposed. Then the want of confidence which spread and permeated the whole public, was confirmed by the Curran Bridge scandal, and the incapacity and mismanagement which was shown to have characterized the administration of the public departments. And to-day our humiliation is complete. A lower depth has been found when we learn that, in addition to incapacity and mismanagement, treachery and mutiny have been found to exist at the very foot of the vice-regal throne. Sir, one day we are told that hon. gentlemen opposite have a leader entitled to respect. One day the hon. gentleman, the Finance Minister, comes down and asks his followers to give their adhesion and their loyalty to a man who, I think, he, or, at all events, one of his colleagues, at the Bowell banquet in Belleville, declared was a man worthy of being selected by Her Majesty for the high position in which he was placed, and at that banquet the true and faithful were called upon to rally around this able man who had been selected to succeed Sir John Thompson. They came down to Parliament, and in the Speech from the Throne intimated that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was a fit and proper person to continue in the leadership; but two or three days afterwards, those hon. gentlemen came down and told us in euphemistic language that he was incapacitated for the post, and was a fool. We were further told that they could have no confidence in a Government so constituted. But we are now told that those mutineers have gone back, and to-day they are feeding at the public crib, as the Postmaster General says, from a sense of public duty, and, as their followers outside the House allege, from party allegiance. Party allegiance can excuse a good deal, but it is hateful and disgusting when it involves the loss of self-respect. I should like to know, Mr. Speaker, whether those hon. gentlemen, after the statement they made here that their leader was a man unfit to govern and to rule, and who went out because they thought the state was unsafe under his guidance, can possibly have any self-respect now they have gone back under the same man, without a single change in the composition of the Cabinet, except the introduction of Sir Charles Tupper, Bart. If they can have self-respect, can any of their followers have respect for them? I should like hon. gentlemen to ask, not those who place party loyalty and party allegiance in the fore-front, but men in the party who believe there is public honour, truth, and justice, what they think of the position which those hon. gentlemen have assumed, and of the respect which should be entertained for men acting as they have acted. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have fallen into the error of mistaking opportunism for states-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

manship, and have to learn that self-seeking is not patriotism. If truth, honour and patriotism can all be sacrificed on the altar of self, then there is a poor future in store for this country. But I have no such low estimate of the better element in the Conservative party, because I know, myself, hundreds of them who are as good, or better, than I am.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say, unhesitatingly, that I know there are hundreds of such, not in this city, but scattered throughout the Dominion, and the contempt with which we look upon these men is exceeded by the contempt with which these honest Conservatives look at them. Why, Sir, the party heeler may to-day shout with joy, and the hoodler may smile at the possible return of the good times when he can fleece the public treasury again. But the old-fashioned virtues of truth and honour which are still enshrined in the hearts of the tens of thousands of Conservatives in this Dominion impel them to look with loathing and contempt upon men who went out one day because their master was an imbecile, and not finding anything to do, went back again under the same master to the crib, at which they had been feeding. But, Sir, the verdict which Cardwell has pronounced, and the verdict which Montreal Centre has pronounced, and the verdict which Jacques Cartier has pronounced was repeated yesterday by West Huron, and, if I mistake not, it will be re-echoed in every district in Canada where truth is valued above deception, and where self-respect and honesty have not been bartered for falsehood and selfishness.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise this afternoon with the least idea in the world of following up the apologies, and substitutions for argument and logic, which have been so freely used by hon. gentlemen opposite. Neither do I intend to ask the members of this House, who have something much better to do, to give me one single moment of their time in listening to any attempt of mine to reply to the usual—no, I am not quite right in saying simply the usual—but the more than usual exaggerations and misrepresentations which these hon. gentlemen have made, of documents which have been placed before them, and are to-day in the public records to be read by them, and by all members of this House. What in the world, a gentleman thinks, before an intelligent House, and in an intelligent country, can be gained by a mere parody and utter misrepresentation of the documents submitted—and submitted in no haste—and put upon the records, I cannot, for the life of me, conceive. That these hon. gentlemen have done from the first one who spoke (Mr. Laurier) to the last one who has just sat down (Mr. Davies). I am here to be