

position of the Minister of Finance was the result of natural selection on the part of the Prime Minister or on the part of the Conservative party. I read the speech of the Minister of Finance at his nomination a few days ago, and he told the people he had entered the Cabinet through the open door. I have no doubt he did, but how did he get the door opened? The door was locked, barred and fastened, but it was opened because certain influences with a battering-ram on their shoulders, came to the door and smashed the bars. Does anybody think he entered the Cabinet with the consent of the Minister of Trade and Commerce? Does anybody believe he entered with the consent of the Borden Club or the Albany Club or the First Ward, or Fourth Ward or Fifth Ward Conservatives of Toronto? Was he the free choice of the Prime Minister? I say no, and I know I am correct. He was the choice of whom? He was the choice of the trusts, of the mergers, of the corporations, and he sits in his place today with the record of never having given more than one Conservative vote in his life, and of having been until last spring a pronounced Liberal. He sits there, the representative of the trusts, the mergers and the corporations.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) will please withdraw that expression. I think it scarcely parliamentary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I hardly think my statement is unparliamentary.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is not bowing to the ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. Bow a little deeper.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thinks I should withdraw the statement I will do so in deference to him because I feel more sorry for him than for any man in that Cabinet. For the past seven or eight years I have seen the Minister of Trade and Commerce the dominant Conservative figure in this House. I have seen him the real if not the titular leader of the Conservative party. On all great occasions he was the leader of debate, he formulated the Conservative policy, he dictated terms, and now I do not like to see him relegated to a more or less insignificant position in the councils of his party. And, when I speak now, I speak more in sorrow than in anger, because during the past summer I had the honour of knowing my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) more intimately than at any previous time and I found him a most genial and agreeable travelling companion. I found him above all things a thorough Imperialist. There is nothing

Mr. GUTHRIE.

anti-British in the make-up of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He is an Imperialist from beginning to end and it is with sorrow that I see him denied his rightful post, and another taken in his stead, contrary to the desire of the great majority of the Conservatives throughout the Dominion.

Perhaps there was a reason for it. I have no doubt there was a reason for it, and I believe the real reason is now the dominating influence in that cabinet of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk).

I am going to direct my remarks to the proposed amendment to the Address, and to what it suggests. I think that amendment is most opportune. I remember particularly that just a year ago, on the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, the hon. Minister of Public Works moved in this House an amendment upon the navy question. In the speech from the Throne on that occasion the navy was mentioned, with the progress that had been made in regard to it. But that did not satisfy the hon. Minister of Public Works, and he undertook to move an amendment. I think he said that his object in doing so was to allay the tormenting condition which existed in Canada over that naval proposal. His amendment was in the language following:

The House regrets that the speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to imperial armaments.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister was evidently not satisfied with that amendment of his quondam colleague. He moved a second amendment and the only difference to a casual observer between the amendment of the Minister of Public Works, and the amendment of the Prime Minister, was that the Prime Minister, for I think purposes of his own, premised his amendment with a bold statement of the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the British Crown and empire. I believe that the intention of the Prime Minister, when he moved that amendment, was to drive from him openly the support of the so called Nationalist party in this House. He did not want them particularly to vote for his amendment, and he knew of no better method of preventing them doing so than by prefacing it with a declaration of the unalterable loyalty and devotion of the people of Canada to the British Crown and empire. The result of the division proved my case in that respect. How did hon. members vote on that occasion? The amendment of the Prime Minister was put first. The Nationalists of the House now