

*War Appropriation Bill*

dominion government; I was fighting Bennett on behalf of the Liberal party. I do not hesitate to repeat to my hon. friend what I had already said in the house when he was in England. He told us that there should be no party politics in war. Am I right in that? Well, if it is all right for me, it should be all right for him; and if I cannot recommend any one of my electors to an appointment in the militia, I do not see how he can recommend anybody from Barclay's bank, of which he was one of the directors, and put him in the Department of National Defence, as in the case of Mr. Magee, or bring someone into the Department of Munitions and Supply, as was done with Mr. Borden. I do not suppose that only in Barclay's Bank of Canada are there to be found able men. I said that when he was away, and I say it now he is here. He may listen to me if he wishes. If not, it is his own business.

With regard to the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), I will tell him that when I was fighting Bennett during the five years he was in power; when I was supporting the present Minister of National Defence, who was then the financial pundit of the Liberal party; when I was supporting and applauding the Minister of Munitions and Supply—I would like to see him here, not behind the curtain; he is smoking a pipe; I would like him to come into the chamber and listen to what I am saying—I was not building elevators for R. B. Bennett at different places in Canada. I have no lesson to receive from these gentlemen, because I am fighting the cause of the Liberal party for my chief, the Prime Minister of Canada. I am glad to see the minister being applauded by good Tories. But I am fighting the cause of the Liberal party for my chief in order that he shall not be stabbed in the back after they have burned enough incense under his nose.

With reference to this matter, one of the most serious that we have discussed, it is time to see that there is a master, and that the master should be the Prime Minister of Canada, my chief. We should see also that the working members of the cabinet should not be suffering the weight of intrigue or the trouble of intrigue from any of their colleagues or from anyone holding a responsible position under one of these gentlemen.

I shall be through in a moment, but there is something else I want to say. It is that some of these people have not always been

[Mr. Pouliot.]

burning incense under the nose of the Prime Minister. There is the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), who said that the Prime Minister was well qualified for peace-time leadership, but that in war time his qualifications for peace-time leadership disqualified him for war-time leadership. That was said in May last. This is a copy that I have received from *Hansard*, and since I never correct my speeches and I rely on *Hansard*, I have this in my hand. He said:

I have been a friend of the Prime Minister of Canada for many years and have admired his many excellent qualities. He was prepared, as few in this country have ever been, by long years of education and training in statecraft for public life. He is a man of high character, a man of peace. I wonder whether these qualities, which are so admirable in times of peace, are not the very qualities which disqualify him now in time of war.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Bruce: The Prime Minister's Asquithian attitude of "wait and see", or in other words, let public opinion become crystallized and then follow it, may have been good statecraft for a virile people in ordinary peace times, but it is not the attitude for war time.

Mr. Grant: He was elected in war time.

Mr. Bruce: It is now absolutely imperative that we have a man of action who will lead public opinion instead of following it. This man must have a strong and forceful character, must be one who will not be influenced by personal or private considerations, and will be ready to brush aside red tape and all other obstacles in the way of quick and decisive action. Last evening we had an illustration of party loyalty on the part of the Minister of Finance which was most commendable. When I listened to him I could not help the reflection that history may repeat itself and that what has happened in the mother country might with advantage happen here. The Minister of Finance enjoys the respect and confidence of both sides of this house, as well as that of the people of Canada generally. With his splendid war record, his undoubted ability in finance and law, his well known driving force and character, may I venture to suggest that he is the one man in the Prime Minister's cabinet—

Mr. Martin: You are trying to undermine him.

Mr. Bruce: —qualified and equipped to lead a war government. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom was changed in spite of the fact that Mr. Chamberlain had very strong support in the House of Commons, 418 supporters as against the combined Liberal and Labour strength of 197, but he was forced by pressure of public opinion to hand over the seals of office to Mr. Churchill, a man of great energy and ability in whom the people had confidence.

The minister referred to, who was one of the colleagues of the Prime Minister, did not disavow what was said by the hon. member for Parkdale; he listened to him just as though he had been drinking honey and milk. Afterwards, when I denounced bitterly