

gard to the minority claims in Manitoba when it appeared we had not the confidence of so large a section of the party, that we could not as it appeared then obtain a representative of the French Catholics of Quebec in place of Mr. Angers. That is the frank statement I sought to make.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it not a strange thing, then, that two members from that province should be willing to assume the responsibility of not having a third Minister in the House of Commons? The Prime Minister had to have recourse to the other Chamber, where their seats are absolutely safe, and where so much patriotism prevails. Did the hon. gentleman, might I ask, make an honest effort to combine the seven bolters—if I may use that expression—in an effort to induce some Senator to accept the position?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The vacancy was in the Senate and the vacancy has been filled.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is not an answer to my question. Was an effort made by the seven bolting Ministers prior to their taking the final step of resignation, to induce some Senator—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot take that question seriously.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The reason they have assigned is one that will not bear consideration for one moment. Another instance was given by Sir Mackenzie Bowell of a portfolio being vacant during the whole session, when, I think, the hon. gentleman himself and many of his colleagues sat in the Cabinet without raising any protest against it. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that when it was possible for a place held by the great Sir Charles Tupper to remain vacant during the whole session, it was dangerous, in fact fatal, to any measure proposed before this House, that one of the portfolios should remain vacant? Is Mr. Desjardins of the Senate a greater man, a more powerful man, than the great Sir Charles Tupper, whose praises we have heard so loudly sung to-day? Is the Cabinet saved, is the country saved, only through the patriotism and self-denial of Hon. A. Desjardins of the Senate? That would seem to be the position we are placed in at the present time. Well, Sir, it is a serious matter to trifle with Parliament. The honour and dignity of Parliament should not be trampled upon by men who hold the places of advisers to His Excellency the Governor General. I am sorry to say that the records are before us showing that this is not the only time that these gentlemen have come before us telling us tales irreconcilable in their nature. Both statements cannot be true, yet both are made by themselves. They went on the public platform in this country and made declarations that they were united as one man, that there

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.)

was not a shred of disunion among them—the very expression that was used—

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And now the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I ask him, then, if those who attended these public meetings will not say that the men who addressed them lied to them when they told them that? I ask him how these gentlemen are ever to face the public again and tell them that there is not a shred of disunion among them, when a late member of the Government told us no longer ago than yesterday that one of their number came to him and asked him to join him in driving another of their number from their midst. Sir, when they go before this people again and tell them anything, does the hon. gentleman suppose that their words will carry any weight? Not that I want to throw any opprobrium upon them, but, Sir, the country's welfare is concerned in this matter. The people of Canada do not want to have it recorded and go forth as a fact that the men who advise His Excellency in this country are men who, on public platforms, will state to the people what their own words give the lie to when Parliament meets in this House, as I claim has been done by these hon. gentlemen since this session opened. Well, Sir, let us see what these gentlemen said with reference to this very Prime Minister, whose weakness and incapacity they assigned as a reason in this House for sending in their resignations at the time they did. What do I find in reference to that matter? I read what the hon. Secretary of State said with reference to this same Prime Minister, Sir Mackenzie Bowell; I read from the "Mail-Empire" report of December 7th, 1895, at Orangeville:

He compared the present Premier with the leader of the Liberal party. For seventeen years Sir Mackenzie Bowell has been an honoured member of the Government who had successfully administered the affairs of his department. During all these seventeen years not one mark could be placed against Sir Mackenzie's honesty, either as a Minister or as a public man.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the reason you wanted to kick him out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not accuse my hon. friend opposite of giving still another reason; that reason is assigned by my hon. friend:

Not only that, but the Premier has always favoured the broadest lines of policy, and had always supported plans for Canadian progress and development.

A broad man, a large man, the very man the country wants. He could not have given a description of a stronger intellect, and a more progressive statesman than he gives there: