easily disposed of in favour of new ones. I remember the first principle he advocated when he entered public life. He came here with a valise, and I suppose he had his political principles in the valise. What was the first principle he had in his valise? It was a principle which served a useful purpose. His great political principle, and before it all other great questions faded into insignificance, was prohibition. The welfare of the country demanded that the first consideration, higher than that of party, should be given to the question of prohibition. That was his political capital for many a year; that was the only article in his political valise. He arrived in Ottawa with his political valise. Perhaps I am wrong in saying that he had only one principle. He had another stowed away which did not take up much room and did not occupy a very long time in that valise, but he entered this House pledged as an independent Conservative to stand up for all good measures. Party was a secondary consideration for him; his country demanded his first attention. He had these two principles when he entered public life. What became of them? The independent Conservative principle could not be allowed to stand, because it stood in the way of preferment, and so the first thing that happened his little valise was to deprive it of the presence in it of his principle of political independence. It stood in the way of his entering the cabinet. It was thrown overboard and he got a portfolio. But it was not enough to get a portfolio. It is one thing to get a portfolio; it is another thing to retain a portfolio. He has had some experience in both of these. He had to get rid of his other principle, and prohibition was thrown overboard, and with it his little valise. As time advanced he deemed it necessary to avow his being devoutly possessed of another principle. What was that principle? He had taken office. He had become a strict party man. It was essential to him an apostate now but then a party man, that he should stand by his party, that he should be true to the government of which he was a member and true to the premier under whom he enlisted. His principle was—and it was a right one; it was a principle that he was bound to live up to—that he should be true and loyal to his chief.

That is one of the principles he made profession of, but how long did that principle remain in his valise? It was there until it suited his purpose to dispose of it, and when was that? Sir John Macdonald, who first took him into office, had disappeared, others had been his chiefs and had disappeared also, and at last he enlisted under the banner of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. The history of Canada tells what then became of his principle of loyalty to his chief; the scenes that took place in this chamber and in the ante-rooms and lobbies of this House tell what he did with that principle. Lastly, in 1896, on the eve of an election, the hon. gentleman evidently believing that it was good politics to stand by the minority, declared his undying allegiance to the cause of minorities. In 1896 he advocated the cause of minorities, he talked of respect for the constitution, but he found it didn't pay and to-day he seizes the opportunity to sever himself from the last of his political principles. No longer has the hon. gentleman any use for a political valise; hereafter a carpet bag will take its place.

Mr. FOSTER. A steamer trunk.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman spent part of this day attacking ministers and ex-ministers and in one of his outbursts he said that he hoped for once some minister would go out of office for the sake of principle and would remain out of office for the sake of principle. The thought of going out of office and remaining out of office is a disturbing dream to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). He cannot address a public meeting nor can he speak in parliament without talking of ministerial explanations and the principles of public men. Let the hon. gentleman be frank and tell us if he resigned on principle. A few months ago he told the electors of North Toronto, if he is reported correctly in his own organs, that he resigned office on a question of policy. I was present in this chamber when he stated to this House the reasons why he resigned office, and in those reasons there was no question of principle involved. He then declared that there was no difference between himself and his leader on any question of principle or of policy, but what is the sequel? That has been told us of late, and it is an extraordinary explanation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) told us in 1896 that he had resigned not from personal ambition of any kind, but for the good of the party and of the country. But, a few weeks ago, the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, his late chief and leader, speaking in another chamber, told us why he had resigned. Perhaps he will now admit or deny the accuracy of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's assertion. Sir Mackenze Bowell declared that the resignation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was not on account of any difference of policy or principle, but because of the overweening ambition of the hon. gentleman to become Prime Minister of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) smiles. I will make it clear to him. The hon. gentleman is setting himself up as a standard for the guidance of the public men of this country, but let us see whether he is a safe guide. Sir Mackenzie Bowell said (I quote from Senate 'Hansard,' 1st March, 1905):

When he told the people of Toronto at the last Dominion election that he left the government on account of differences of opinion, on questions of policy and that His Excellency