

Minister of Labour, Hon. T. W. Crothers.
Minister of Railways and Canals, Hon. J. D. Reid.
Minister of Overseas Military Forces, Hon. Sir A. E. Kemp.
Secretary of State, Hon. Martin Burrell.
Postmaster General, Hon. P. E. Blondin.
Minister of Interior, Hon. Arthur Meighen.
Minister of Inland Revenue, Hon. A. Sevigny.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Naval Service, Hon. C. C. Ballantyne.
Minister of Customs, Hon. A. L. Sifton.
Minister of Immigration and Colonisation, Hon. J. A. Calder.
President of Privy Council, Hon. N. W. Rowell.
Minister of Militia, Hon. S. C. Mewburn.
Minister of Agriculture, Hon. T. A. Crerar.
Minister of Public Works, Hon. F. B. Carvell.
Ministers without Portfolio: Hon. Frank Cochrane, Hon. Sir Jas. A. Loughheed, Hon. A. K. Maclean, Hon. G. D. Robertson.
Solicitor General, Hon. Hugh Guthrie.

In looking over that list one is struck first of all by its coalitionist complexion as it was held out in evidence before the people at the time. There were four ministers without portfolio, the Solicitor General adding one more to the ministry. There were eighteen other ministers, seven of whom were chosen from the ranks of the Liberal party. If we add the name of one of the ministers without portfolio, that would mean eight of one complexion politically, and ten of the other, so as to make what the people were led to believe at that time was a sort of fifty-fifty administration. Of those members, the following have ceased to be members of the administration, either through death or resignation:

The late Hon. Frank Cochrane.
Sir Robert Borden.
Hon. Sir Thomas White.
Hon. T. W. Crothers.
Hon. Martin Burrell.
Hon. A. Sevigny.
Hon. T. A. Crerar.
Hon. F. B. Carvell.
Hon. S. C. Mewburn.
Hon. A. K. Maclean.
Hon. N. W. Rowell.
The late Hon. A. L. Sifton.

In other words, twelve of the members of the Administration which went before the country in 1917 have ceased to be members of the present Administration. I am prepared to admit that the personnel might to a limited extent be expected to change with time; but there is this significant point to be noted in connection with the changes that have taken place in the Administration, that for the most part the resignations have been of those hon. members who entered the ministry at the time they did because they believed it to be a ministry formed for war purposes, and who

joined the ministry to give that Liberal complexion which a real coalition was expected to have. With these hon. gentlemen having resigned from the Government in the numbers they have, I ask my right hon. friend how does he presume to regard his ministry as in any sense a legitimate successor to the one which preceded it?

My right hon. friend in his speeches throughout the country has had a good deal to say about the war record of the late Administration. He has urged that record as a ground why his Administration should have the confidence of the people of this country. I would ask him, has he observed that the Ministers, who, for the most part—there are one or two exceptions, I admit—were responsible for such record as the Government made during the war are the ones who have since left, and are not members of his Administration? Either he has no confidence in them, or they have no confidence in him. Will my right hon. friend presume to say that none of the credit of the late Administration in the carrying on of the war was due to the hon. gentlemen who are not members of his Administration at the present time? Let us take one or two names. We were told that the Hon. F. B. Carvell was a strength to the whole Government because of his personality. Will my right hon. friend say that his ministry has not been weakened through the loss of a member like the Hon. Mr. Carvell? Take the case of the present member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Is he not entitled to any credit in the late Administration for the winning of the war, as my right hon. friend likes to put it? Surely my right hon. friend has no right to seek credit for his Administration on account of the services of the hon. member for East Hamilton, who is not in the ministry at the present time. Take, similarly, the case of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). There was a gentleman representing the agricultural interests of this country, as well as one who was a strong liberal at the time he was taken into the Administration. His name was given out to the public as that of one who lent strength to the Administration because of those circumstances. He is not in my right hon. friend's Administration at the present time. He is directly opposed to him. How can my right hon. friend lay claim to any public confidence in his Administration on account of what the hon. member for Marquette did in helping forward the work of the Government during the period of the war? Then there is the

hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean). Though he was a Minister without portfolio, he was Chairman of several important committees, and rendered valuable service. He is not in my right hon. friend's ministry, but is sitting opposite to him at the present time. How can my right hon. friend possibly claim that his ministry is entitled to carry on by virtue of the services which the hon. member for Halifax rendered during the period of the war? Then there is the Hon. N. W. Rowell, the former President of the Privy Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member, I think, was quite in order in referring to the personnel of the ministry to give their names, but in referring to hon. gentlemen individually who are at the moment members of the House, it would be better, and most certainly the correct practice, if he would refer to them by the names of their constituencies.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am very pleased to defer to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I recognize to be quite proper. The point I wish to make plain is that as respects the Unionist Administration the personality of the gentlemen composing it was an all important consideration. The name of the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell), the former President of the Privy Council, was put forward all over this country as that of one who led the Liberal party in the province of Ontario, and it was put forward particularly to support the claims of the Government on Liberals in Ontario. How can my right hon. friend claim for himself any expression of confidence on the part of the people in virtue of the presence in the former Administration of the hon. member for Durham? He is no longer a member of the ministry.

Then I would ask my right hon. friend, what about the former Minister of Finance, the hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White). His name and his reputation stood high in this country at that time. Surely he is entitled to some of the credit of the late ministry in the matter of the winning of the war. Can my right hon. friend lay claim to any of that credit for his ministry? The hon. gentleman whom I have just mentioned is not today a member of the ministry. My right hon. friend has been unable to induce him to come into his Government.

Lastly, I ask my right hon. friend, is no credit due to the former Prime Minister

Sir Robert Borden? He had long and distinguished service in the position of Prime Minister, and his name and the circumstance of his experience was a factor in helping to win the confidence of the people for his Administration. How can my right hon. friend claim any credit for what was accomplished through the ex-Prime Minister's efforts in the winning of the war as a ground on which this ministry should have the confidence of the people at the present time, seeing that the ex-Prime Minister has resigned and is unwilling to come into my right hon. friend's ministry?

So I say, if we go over the personnel of the Cabinet as it existed at the time it made its appeal to the people of Canada as a Unionist Administration and compare it with the present Government, we find the two so different in character and in personnel that it is presumption, to say the least, for my right hon. friend to assume that he is entitled to any credit for work which the previous Government carried on, or to any continuance of confidence from the people of Canada as a result.

May I ask my right hon. friend this question, and I hope he will answer it—Does he believe that if he himself had been called upon to form a Unionist Administration in 1917, he would have been able to do it? Does he mean to say that if he instead of the ex-Prime Minister had gone before the country as Prime Minister seeking support for a ministry at that time that the people would have given to him the confidence which was given to the late Prime Minister and the colleagues he had about him? Unless he is prepared to stand up and say that he was just as capable of forming a ministry as the ex-Prime Minister and that the people have just as much confidence in him and his present colleagues as in the ex-Prime Minister and the group that surrounded him, by what authority does he presume to carry on government, as one holding the confidence of the people of this country?

But, Sir, not only is the character and the personnel of the ministry changed, as I have described, but what is most important of all, the aims and purposes of the two ministries are entirely different. The Unionist Administration went before the people of this country as a war Administration, for the purpose of carrying on the war and dealing with the problems of the war. Will my right hon. friend say that this is a war Administration? Unless he is prepared to say that he is entitled to