

the Governor General knowing the facts called them back into the government.

I do not like to read the words, but here they are:

He knew he was telling what was not correct.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell continues:

I have in my hand copies of the report of speeches delivered by him in Toronto during the last Dominion election as reported by the 'Globe,' the 'News' and the 'Mail,' in which I find that in reply to questions put to him he said amongst other things, when asked why he left the government, that he did not purpose to answer the question that belonged to the Privy Council, and that his mouth was shut.

We never find it in that condition in this chamber.

But added that on all points of importance they must have a union of ideas and that any one disagreeing must resign. That, he said, was all they had done. Continuing, he said, 'When a member of the cabinet or members disagreed with their leader they had done as they were bound on their honour to do—resigned.' In another speech he said: 'The Governor had been quite satisfied with the reasons for the resignation of six ministers on a question of policy, and had shown his confidence in them by reappointing them later.' That did not satisfy his hearers, one of whom exclaimed: 'That still leaves the question unanswered. Why did you resign?' To which Mr. Foster replied 'I don't intend to answer. I am not at liberty to reveal the secrets of the Privy Council.' An ingenious way of evading an answer. The fact is, the reasons given in the House of Commons for his resigning were never discussed in the Privy Council before he resigned, therefore, he had no oath to respect in that particular.

Again, speaking in this chamber not very long ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said:

Am I not to be allowed to leave the government if I differ from it on points of policy or principle?

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman in this House during the present session, but how does that fit in with the statement he made on the very occasion of his resignation when he was probably most likely to give an accurate account. Speaking from his seat in 1896 he said:

I may say in the first place that there is no disagreement between ourselves and the premier upon any question of public policy, trade or constitutional, with regard to which action has already been taken, or in respect to which attitude has been assumed by the government under the present premier.

I leave my hon. friend to struggle with these two conflicting statements. He goes on to give what he deems to be the reason, namely, the desire to serve under a gentleman of perhaps greater power. In fact he

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

describes the cabinet as beyond the control of the First Minister. He was unable to keep those unruly members in order. There was disorder in the cabinet, and the hon. member for North Toronto added to the disorder by trying to break up the cabinet. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman seems to be troubled when any retiring minister returns to the cabinet, and he seems to be troubled when any retiring minister remains without the cabinet. He takes exception to Mr. Blair not having returned. No person can take exception to his conduct in that respect. But when the honourable member for North Toronto went out of the cabinet, he took precious good care that no one should get into his place. He rendered the reconstruction impossible except by his readmission to the cabinet. Does the hon. gentleman set up that method as a standard? Is that his idea of political morality? Is that his conception of what should be the conduct of hon. gentlemen who take office to serve their country? Surely it is time for him to throw off this hypocritical garb in which he seeks to give moral lectures as to how public men should be loyal to their principles.

To-day, running through the whole of his speech, I thought I was able to discover one distinct line of policy. The Bill before the House is one to deal with a very important question concerning the Northwest. It is a question upon which the people may be honestly divided in opinion; but it is the bounden duty of every loyal citizen and of every member of this House to render such assistance as he can to bring about a satisfactory settlement of this question. What was the action of the hon. gentleman? If I have correctly read his policy, if I have discovered the object he had in his speech, it was not to be a messenger of peace and harmony, but if possible to light the incendiary fires of religious and racial discord from one end of this Dominion to the other. The hon. gentleman represents North Toronto. In olden days he came from the east. He stayed there as long as the people would keep him. In olden days, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if he would have professed the principles that he has professed to-day. But, Sir, he has rested in another place, and his new principles of to-day are appropriate and fashionable in North Toronto, and he put them on, and with a great deal of force throws off the old discarded ones. What object had the hon. gentleman in asking the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) whether or not he was content with the amendments of the government? The hon. member for North Toronto, holding up these amendments to the member for Labelle, who is as we all know a devout son of his church, said to him in triumph: All the comfort and consolation you can get from these amendments is that at half-past three o'clock in