

declared that Mr. Foster had given utterance to his own sentiments. No doubt it was particularly mentioned that Mr. Haggart gave his adhesion to Mr. Foster's remarks, because it was believed that Mr. Haggart was the only member of the government who was not what might be called sound on the important measure then engaging the attention of the government, namely, the Remedial Bill. Mr. Foster said :

They had perhaps learned from the Grit press that their government at Ottawa was disunited and demoralized. Having reassured him, as they had, that the Conservative party outside of Ottawa was in good health, he was there to demonstrate to them with his two colleagues 'that were present.' (Dr. Montague was there also) and also for those that were not present that the Conservative government now, as of old, was a government which was united on its different lines of policy without a shred of disunion.

The *Mail* adds :

He bestowed a warm eulogy upon Sir Mackenzie Bowell, whose character, after 17 years administration of one of the greatest departments of the government had not shown one trace of dishonesty or incapacity.

Then, during the Cardwell election, which took place the other day, Dr. Montague spoke as follows :

For 17 years Sir Mackenzie Bowell had been an honoured member of the Government who had successfully administered the affairs of his department. During all these 17 years not one mark could be placed against Sir Mackenzie's honesty either as a minister or as a public man. Not only that, but the Premier had always favoured the broadest lines of policy, had always supported plans for Canadian progress and development. In addition to that, first as minister and now as Premier, he had invariably supported the strengthening of the ties which bound them to the dear old motherland.

These are the views of leading members of the dissentient faction who recently left the government. Does any hon. gentleman believe, in the face of these statements, and in the light of common sense, that the true reason of their course is given in Mr. Foster's statement? I think not. No one is so extremely credulous as to believe for one moment that this is the case. These hon. gentlemen, I think, have placed themselves in a position which has never hitherto been occupied by any statesmen of Canada. On Thursday last—just one week ago to-day—they were a united cabinet. They had prepared a speech for His Excellency the Governor General in which they tacitly acquiesced in their leader's

policy, or else they acted dishonestly and in contravention of their oath of office. Hon. gentlemen are no doubt aware that Privy Councillors take a special oath to be loyal to the Queen's representative and to be true and loyal to each other as well. Through the mouth of His Excellency they informed Parliament that they were prepared to bring down a number of measures. Among other things it was stated that it was necessary for the government, in pursuance of its declared policy, to introduce legislation in regard to the subject of separate schools in Manitoba. Not only that, but they also intimated that they were prepared to submit to Parliament a number of other bills relating to the strengthening of Canada's military defences, copyright and other matters. Then with extraordinary cant and hypocrisy, they invoked the blessing of the Divine Being upon their labours in these words :

I commend these subjects and others which may come before you to your earnest consideration, relying upon your wisdom and prudence under the Divine guidance to discharge with dignity and effect the high trust committed to your care.

They committed themselves to these expressions on Thursday last. When the House met after the speech had been delivered, the Premier moved that this address be taken up on the following Wednesday. Mr. Foster, in the other chamber, gave notice that the address would be taken up on the following Tuesday, that is, last Tuesday. Yet on Saturday it was notorious that these seven gentlemen had tendered their resignations—less than forty-eight hours afterwards. Does any one suppose that within that space of time they had come to the conclusion that my hon. friend opposite was incapable of carrying on the government any longer, that up to that particular moment he had all the mental vigour necessary for the work of leading the administration of the country but that within forty-eight hours he had so lamentably deteriorated as to be unfit for his post? The thing is too absurd for any of us to place the slightest credence in it. These gentlemen, I think, by their strange conduct in placing not only both Houses of Parliament but the representative of the Crown in such an equivocal position, have rendered it impossible that they can ever again be the members of any cabinet, for it is a very serious dereliction of duty, not only as regards the Crown, but