

to satisfy most of them that their doubts were not warranted and that the measure was a good one. So the day came that the measure had to be taken up. We had not a large majority at the time and a member or two more or less had to be carefully considered. There was one young man who was half Scotch and half Dutch; that is a combination which produces a large degree of determination, I might almost say, of obstinacy; and that good friend remained unconvinced. So we had to proceed with the debate with the possibility of his voting against us. Then an hon. gentleman on the other side rose and commenced an attack, as the hon. gentleman commenced yesterday and with almost equal violence. Before he had spent many minutes, my doubting friend came over to my side and he said, It's all right, Fielding, that fellow has fixed me. Now if there was a single doubting, hesitating member in the party which supports my right hon. friend in this House, the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday would undoubtedly have fixed him in his loyalty and devotion to the chief. That is the effect which I am sure it has had in the House, and I believe it will have outside.

The hon. gentleman, and the leader of the opposition also, devoted a considerable portion of time to the discussion, sometimes grave and sometimes humorous, of the circumstances under which two new ministers have been brought into the cabinet of my right hon. friend. Now one would have thought that this was not a most fruitful subject for discussion at this time. Some years ago an advertisement appeared in a London paper to this effect, that a man who had been very successful in business and was about to retire, offered for a small consideration to communicate to others the secret of his successful career. A small fee was asked, and a great many people applied; and to every one a slip of paper was sent with these words: 'My success is due to the fact that I have always tried to mind my own business and let other people do the same.' Now one might think that the selection of ministers for the cabinet was particularly the business of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, and that there was no particular reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should ask more than the usual formal ministerial explanations. But it appears they thought they should go more deeply into the matter, and should inquire into the motive that prompted the selection of this, that and the other man, and that they should pour out their sympathy upon various members of this House who had not been honoured with seats in the cabinet. Well, if my hon. friends opposite had not been restrained from that discussion by the motto of that successful business man, one might think they would be restrained by regard to the some-

Mr. FIELDING.

what old proverb about certain people who live in glass houses not being the proper persons to throw stones.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have not had to do anything in the way of cabinet making for some considerable time, and there is small prospect that they will be called upon to engage in that honest enterprise and industry. Still they have had something to do in the way of promotion. It is not so long ago that they had occasion to select a gentleman who, to some extent, corresponds with the man who holds the rank and dignity of a minister of the Crown; and if it be right for them to inquire carefully into the circumstances under which a minister is brought into this House, and to sympathize with those who did not obtain places, we, not to be lacking in generous sympathy may devote a moment or two to inquiring how it was that the leader of the opposition came by the place which he now fills. Many hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there are many men over here who had laboured faithfully in the ranks for ten or twelve years and yet they were ignored. Well, are there not many men over there who have laboured even longer than that and yet have been ignored by the Conservatives. Why, the hon. member for North Toronto asked, did not years of faithful labour count in this case? Did they count in the case of my hon. friend himself? He has laboured long, and I hope I may say, faithfully, in the vineyard; but when the time came, strange to say, though he had been in this House and laboured in and out in the cause of his party for many years, he was ignored, and the gentleman who sits beside him became a leader. I follow the methods of the discussion yesterday—Was it an insult to the hon. gentleman from North Toronto? Did he not measure up to the standard—again I am quoting the leader of the opposition—did he not measure up to the proper standard? Was he lacking in ability? Was he lacking in experience? Why was it that they passed over my distinguished friend, and selected as leader of the opposition a gentleman who came into this parliament many years later?

Mr. FOSTER. A conundrum?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a conundrum. Then there is my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who sits on the left of the member for North Toronto, and who had laboured in the vineyard much more than ten or twelve years. My hon. friend was in this House nearly a quarter of a century before the leader of the opposition came in. He had been a cabinet minister, he had been a close associate of Sir John A. Macdonald's. Why, Sir, I remember more than once, in my early days of public life, before I came into this House, when I tried to see Sir John A. Macdonald on public business, and