

benches cannot have come together without some of their brethren having been betrayed, without some of the electors, either in Ontario or Quebec, having been sold, and badly sold.

But who is it that has gone back upon his record? Who has abandoned his principles? Is it my hon. friend the Prime Minister? Well, my hon. friend will permit me to tell him, and I do not think he will differ from me, that he has been many things in succession, and nothing long at a time. I believe, however, that he is still a true Tory and imperialist. Is it my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster)? I believe that the fear of the electors of Toronto will keep him to his guns, if nothing else will do it. Is it my hon. friend the new Minister of Finance (Mr. White)? I once knew him in better company, but he has fallen from grace, and it is much to be feared that he has fallen down, down, down, to the lowest depths of the bottomless pit. Is it my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk)? Once upon a time my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, then the private member for Jacques Cartier, was the pride and hope of the Conservative party. He was promoted high in the ranks until he became the first lieutenant of the leader of his party. He sat by his side, cheek by jowl, every day. But unfortunately that accord did not last long. For some reason better known to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, for some reason which he never explained, he left this seat and took a back seat, though still remaining in the ranks of the party. But last year my hon. friend seceded altogether from the ranks of his party, broke openly with his party, and refused any longer to take part in its deliberations. He shook the dust off his feet at the door of the caucus room, would not enter the caucus room. He joined the ranks of the Nationalists, who held Laurier in abomination and Borden in execration.

Those of us who were here last session saw him aloof from his former colleagues, isolated, sullen, tragic, the avenging angel of an outraged people whose sons were soon to be removed from the bosoms of their families and thrown upon the decks of men-of-war to be disembowelled on distant seas fighting for England. This was the language of his new associates, the Nationalists, who, upon the hustings, and in his presence upon more than one platform, denounced the Naval Service law, qualified it as a criminal law 'une loi criminelle' a wicked law, 'une loi maudite'. No wonder, therefore, that my hon. friend, holding such views, dissociated himself from the Conservative party whose only quarrel with the law was that it did not go far enough. My hon. friend was utterly

opposed to the policy of the government, totally opposed to the policy of the opposition—until the 21st of September. For my hon. friend opposite, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), to cross over from this side to that side was natural enough, but for my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) to have jumped over from this side to that side of the table was an acrobatic performance which does honour to his limbs if to nothing else, and which showed that, after all, the weight of principle which my hon. friend carries will never interfere with his movements.

But now my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is in the administration of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden). How did they come together? Sir, the government that we have before us was not the natural government to be expected when an opposition becomes the government of the day—it is a coalition government. Am I speaking too strongly when I say that? I repeat it is a coalition government, and I shall give the proof. Only last year, just two days less than a year ago, on November 22 last, my hon. friend, speaking of the numerous meetings of Mr. Bourassa, of Mr. Lavergne, or the seconder of the address (Mr. Sevigny) and many others which he attended himself and at which certain resolutions were passed condemnatory of the policy of the government, of that of the opposition also, made use of the following words ('Hansard,' page 127):

Certainly the policy of Mr. Borden was condemned at these meetings. A resolution was passed at these meetings wherever they were held condemning the attitude of the government and condemning the attitude of the leader of the opposition. I stand by that resolution, I adhere to it.

I have the resolution; it is a long resolution from which I shall quote the concluding portion as follows:

We blame the federal government and the parliamentary majority, who have imposed on Canada this new naval law, who have launched the country into the vortex of militarism previously denounced with such energy by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who have endangered the peace of Canada, and deflected towards the construction of murderous engines, and the preparation of bloody wars, the millions destined to the development of our agriculture and of our ways of transportation.

This is the part that related to me personally, let me now quote the part referring to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Borden):

We likewise censure the attitude of Mr. Borden and of the opposition behind him, for the adoption of a policy in no way less nefarious.

Now what has taken place to bring my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) into the ranks of the government?