

that very fact I was in honor bound not to refuse to take the responsibility of the succeeding Cabinet's administration. It was not I who laid down this constitutional doctrine. I find it clearly stated by an authority on constitutional law. Hearn in his "Government of England," Vol. II, page 219, says :

" Those persons who overthrow any administration may expect to be required by the king to assist him in the room of those officers whom in consequence of their proceedings he had displaced. Nor is a statesman who is so summoned at liberty to refuse? He has taken upon himself the responsibility of obstructing the Government of the country. If he desires to save himself of the imputation of mere faction, he must endeavour to set up in its place a better Government. The king may fairly address the Commons in the language of the philosophic poet to his friend "*si quid novisti rectius*."

The Leader of the Opposition has stated that I was in negotiation with Mr. Chapleau, while I had the offer of a portfolio in the Joly Government. I most emphatically and formally deny this. My honorable friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands knows when I made the acquaintance of Mr. Chapleau, and that it was not at the time at which my opponents would have you think.

The Leader of the Opposition even pried into my private life in search of arms against me, though I did not do so to him. Such action is a want of courtesy and delicacy of which I could never be guilty. I said here that I did not wish to speak either of the Terrebonne or of the Jacques-Cartier affair.

Nevertheless, that did not prevent him from lifting aside the veil which protects my private life. He has mentioned the election of 1874. I then came forward as an Independent candidate. On the very day on which I was nominated I was appointed a professor in Laval University. At the time, apart from the Opposition candidate, there was

s
t
f
o
in
th
la
mo
de
int
Ho
test
extr
last
He
"
first
ackn
regar
the re