

thought, it is a question that must be dealt with with great care, it is a question in regard to which they must not jump to conclusions. If that be so they can better understand the position that the outgoing government was in. These tenders were received on the first day of May last, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries left for England on May 12, they left England on their return trip on the 3rd July and they arrived at Ottawa on the 11th. Parliament resumed on the 18th July and dissolved on the 29th. That is the answer that I have to give to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to show that there was no time for this government or for the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries to consider those tenders. It is no answer that is satisfactory to the country, for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to shift the burden of responsibility on the outgoing government. Even if they were mistaken in the course that they took then, even if they were not as active as they might have been, when he reads over the speech that his leader delivered on the 12th day of January, and finds that he says that the crisis may be three years, but it is going to come quite probably in three years, he will see that that only leaves him a short time, and that it behoves him to get busy and do his work regardless of what course may have been taken by his predecessors in office.

I submit, therefore, that the answers that were given us by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are not such as should have been given to this House and the country on so important a question as to whether or not we are going to proceed definitely and shortly upon this question of establishing a navy in Canada. Are we going to take that manly position in the empire which we must take in order to be worthy of ourselves and worthy of our sires? I submit that there is the greatest justification for the motion moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition and that there is every reason why we should put the facts before the people and give them to understand why it is that proper steps are not taken to place this country in its proper light as an important portion of the empire to which we belong. I, therefore, upon these grounds, and for these reasons, shall be pleased to support the amendment introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. ARTHUR DE WITT FOSTER (Kings). Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to answer some of the rambling remarks that we have listened to for the last hour and a half, I would like to express my congratulations and the congratulations of the constituency which I have the honour to represent to the hon. the mover (Mr.

Bennett, Calgary) and the hon. the seconder (Mr. Sevigny) of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I am sure that congratulations are due not only to the sister province of New Brunswick for having produced such a speaker as we listened to, but also the province of Quebec for having produced another speaker, a speaker who addressed us in a sister language. I think this House is to be congratulated upon having in it such able gentlemen and, lastly that the country is to be congratulated upon having such able men, with such a future before them to look after its interests when some of the older statesmen shall have passed on.

The hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) who has just taken his seat opened his remarks by reading from a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) a speech delivered by the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden), as well as from one delivered by the right hon. Sir Charles Tupper in reference to reciprocity some years ago, and the inference we might plainly draw from his remarks, or the inference that he wishes us to draw, is that these gentlemen had swallowed their principles. It seems to me that it would not be amiss for the hon. member for Cape Breton to look at his own position, in reference to his record particularly on the important question which was recently before the people of the Dominion of Canada. In the year 1909 he advocated a higher rate of protection on coal than that which we already had in Nova Scotia and the Dominion of Canada. He was then for higher protection, a greater chance for the home market, greater development for our own people under higher protection. But not six months later, what do we find? We find this gentleman swallowing his own principles and adopting the policy of 8 cents lower duty per ton on coal—lower protection three months ago, higher protection one year ago. I do not think we need any better example of how men, not only on the government side of the House, if such may be found, but on the opposition side of the House, will swallow their principles at convenient stages in the political history of the country.

During the last election in his own constituency he was interrupted by some of the miners by the question: How is this 8 cents a ton lower duty on coal going to affect us? What was the answer he gave these men?—work hard and put your trust in God. I submit that this is most excellent advice, but let us see for a moment if the hon. gentleman followed that same advice himself. If we look up the record of 'Hansard' we will find that he had appointed in that constituency some 109 fishery wardens for a certain particular time