

Has anything been said by the leader of the government (Mr. Borden) to make him change his views? Has anything occurred except the verdict of the people on the 21st of September, that my hon. friend now approves of the Act which was so nefarious when the leader of the government was in opposition? How did they come together? What arrangement has been made between them? It is impossible for these two gentlemen to sit together if they still hold the opinions which they held until the 21st of September, and if they now hold different opinions it is their first duty to inform parliament of the new policy they intend to follow. What has taken place? Which is the master mind? Who has brought the other down? Who is it that has given way? Is it the imperial lion who has swallowed the National lamb, or is it the National lamb who has swallowed the imperial lion? Whatever took place between my two hon. friends has remained hermetically sealed in their bosoms. My hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) has spoken on two or three occasions in different subjects, but he has never mentioned the word 'navy'. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has also spoken since the elections. Before the elections he talked of hardly anything but the navy, but he has not opened his mouth on that subject since the elections. He spoke the other day to the people of Hull, and gave most salutary advice to the young people, telling them not to seek a living in the civil service, that they might do better elsewhere, mixing with the people. But, Sir, it is not fair to these young people for him not to tell them also to eschew the naval service where they might be exposed to be disembowelled on the decks of ships on distant seas, fighting for England. Opportunity has been given to these gentlemen to explain their policy, and certainly if they did not choose to do it before, here was the opportunity, when they placed in His Royal Highness's hands a statement of the measures which they were to bring forward for the happiness of the people of Canada. His Royal Highness told us that we should have a Tariff Commission—not a word about the navy. We were told that we should improve the highways—not a word about the navy. We were told that we should improve agriculture—not a word about the navy. But, Sir, there is one who is not quite so discreet, and who lifted a very little corner of the veil, that was my hon. and old friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier). On the occasion of his election by acclamation, my hon. friend the Postmaster General made use of the following language:

When I was called to Mr. Borden's cabinet, I was not asked to withdraw a single line of the programme that I have submitted to my

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

electors, and my efforts will tend to the complete carrying out of this programme. We shall have the referendum that we ask, and we shall stand by the decision of the majority of the Canadian people on that question. Moreover, we may be offered more than a referendum, and we shall be still more glad to accept it.

We would have been interested to know what is more than the referendum which may be offered to the Canadian people. Mr. Armand Lavergne was present on that occasion, and Mr. Lavergne stated that he was not bound by any secret and that he could assure them they would have a referendum. Mr. Armand Lavergne gave us a little more of the secrets of the party, for he told us he had had an interview with the Prime Minister when he was forming his government. He did not say whether he had come by invitation or unsolicited to offer his advice, but at all events he was consulted whether on his motion or on the motion of the Prime Minister does not much matter and he said to the Prime Minister: I am bringing you the regenerated province of Quebec; will you accept it? Well, Sir, when I look at the regenerators of the province of Quebec now sitting on the treasury benches I very much fear that many people will believe that the regenerated province of Quebec is in a worse position than when it was unregenerated. At all events, Mr. Lavergne pretended to speak of the secrets of the government. We are living under constitutional government, an elementary principle of which is that the men who form the administration must have a common policy. Are we to suppose that men who so differed as these gentlemen on the treasury benches did during the elections have now come together on a new policy? If that be so, then the leader of the government will not dispute that it is his bounden duty to acquaint parliament of the policy they have agreed upon and which they intend to pursue. On the other hand, are we to suppose that these men holding views so dissimilar, have formed a cabinet, ignoring altogether such an important public question and still intending to sit there together; the Prime Minister and his friends from the other provinces, holding that the naval policy must be improved, and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and his colleagues from Quebec, holding that it must be wiped out altogether. Constitutional government demands that we should have an explanation of the policy which has been adopted, and as we have not received any explanation we are bound to conclude that the men who now sit together in the administration have no policy upon this question. I believe there is a measure of truth in the statement of Mr. Armand Lavergne and of the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) that there shall