

Militia (Mr. Hughes), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid), into that cabinet. They are men who have accused Borden and Laurier of conspiring together to hurl the French Canadians, bound hand and foot, into the vortex of Imperial defence. They are men who did not once appear upon the same platform with their present leader during the election campaign. They are men who took charge of the French speaking voters in the province of Quebec, while the Prime Minister looked after the English speaking sections of the same province, each preaching his own doctrine upon the navy, differing even upon the question of reciprocity when it suited their conveniences, united only upon one platform 'Anything to beat Laurier,' the platform now re-formed and made over into the song of victory: 'We are here and you are there.'

The Prime Minister says they have always agreed since 1909, but 'Hansard' tells us they have disagreed and voted against each other. They may have agreed, but if so, they agreed to disagree. It may have been the game they played to obtain the victory they now rejoice over; but if so they do not deserve the confidence of the people of Canada. If differences really did exist and concessions have been made by one party or the other to wipe out those differences, parliament and Canada have a right to know who made the concessions. If those differences still exist upon the only important question before the people to-day, they have no constitutional right to be members of the same cabinet. They cannot put us off by asking for time to decide the naval question. The present Prime Minister, three years ago, wanted things done speedily. Canada and the empire, with still greater reason, want things done speedily now. The Minister of Public Works, speaking to the amendment, asked the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to point out in British constitutional history any example of such a representation made to the Crown by the House of Commons within the last three hundred years. When the Minister of Public Works tells us where we can find such an alliance as that made between himself and the Prime Minister, during the last three hundred years we will answer his question. If the representation was not sooner made it was because it was not sooner required. The occasion first arose in Canada in 1911, and when it arose there was upon the floor of the House of Commons an old and beloved leader of a true and loyal opposition who was just celebrating his seventieth birthday, who had devoted his entire life to the welfare of his country, who had cemented together in the bonds of Canadian nationhood people of all races and all creeds, who had made Canada

Mr. BOIVIN.

great, grand and prosperous, and who had just lost some of his most able lieutenants, and the reins of power, in a political struggle fighting for the increased prosperity of his country. He was overpowered and defeated but not disheartened; the day after his defeat he resumed the battle by making the amendment which has caused so much discomfiture to the party in power, an amendment which exactly meets the present situation, and which, although it may be defeated in this House, will be approved by every one of his supporters in this House, and by the majority of the people of Canada.

I referred a moment ago to the race and religious cries we were accused of raising; but it was only to deny the accusation and send it home to those who made it. We have the admission of the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that the Liberal government was defeated in his county, and throughout Ontario, because the Ne Temere decree had been promulgated and published in Canada. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was held responsible for the regulations laid down by the Catholic church, over which he had no control, and maliciously accused of being under the domination of the Church of Rome. In the province of Quebec he was proclaimed by the other division of the Conservative party as being anti-French and anti-Catholic. Even in my own county I was called a traitor to my faith by 'La Croix,' a Catholic paper published in Montreal, and distributed throughout the county, because I did not, like my opponent, undertake and promise to give to the French Canadian Catholics of Manitoba and the new provinces the same rights enjoyed by the English speaking Protestants in Quebec.

Add to this the fact that the English voters were urged to vote against me because I was of French origin. Then conjure up a picture of thousands of Canadian children being disembowelled upon the distant seas of China and Japan, fighting the unjust wars of the British Empire, and you have a sample of the Conservative-Nationalist campaign in Quebec.

That is why they are there and we are here.

Coming as I do from the Eastern Townships, so ably represented in the late cabinet by the Hon. Sidney Fisher, the former member for Brome, and now without representation at the council board of our nation, I must correct a statement made in the course of this debate by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville.) I owe it to the late Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Fisher, because he was largely responsible not only for my election, but also for the election of every other Liberal member from the Eastern Townships. Like the staunch Liberal he is, he sacrificed himself to save others. History