

federacy and the present cabinet does not stop there. Parkman goes on to explain that the chaus were by no means equal in numbers, in influence or in honour. To some of the chaus belonged the right of giving one chief to the nation; others had the right of giving three, or in one case, four chiefs; while others could give none. This must have been the precedent the Prime Minister had in mind when he gave three portfolios and a deputy speakership to the Nationalists, and left the great Presbyterian body without a single representative in the cabinet. For a knowledge of this latter omission I am indebted to the Ottawa 'Citizen' which, as you know, is the morning echo of the Prime Minister's voice in this city.

Speaking a few days ago in this House, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) inquired from my hon. friend the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) if he could find in constitutional history in the last three hundred years, any such representation to the Crown as was contained in this amendment.

My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin) supplied the answer to-day. It might well be answered 'no,' for the simple reason that a similar instance never occurred in England. But when the Minister of Public Works asked that question he forgot that the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) had anticipated it and had supplied the answer by citing the example of Lord James of Hereford, of the Duke of Devonshire, and of other gentlemen in England who had refused to enter cabinets when they could not agree with the policy of the Prime Minister.

In the further course of his speech the Minister of Public Works in replying to a criticism of the personnel of the present cabinet, cited Mr. Tarte and Mr. Dobell as examples of former Conservatives who had been included in the cabinet of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1896. But, these cases are not analogous to the present. In the first place, neither Mr. Tarte nor Mr. Dobell had denounced the leader of the Liberal party as some of the present ministers had denounced the present Prime Minister almost up to the time his cabinet was formed. For years prior to 1896, Mr. Tarte had worked in close harmony with the Liberal party and in 1897, in conjunction with the Liberals he had conducted an investigation into the scandals which ultimately wrecked the Conservative government and at the next ensuing election he ran as a supporter of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In Mr. Dobell's case it is well to recall that he was returned at a by-election in 1895 and Sir Wilfrid Laurier then claimed him as a supporter because Mr. Dobell had included in his election platform a plank in favour of reciprocity with the United States. But, when Sir Wilfrid Laurier made that claim in this House what do you think happened? Why, Sir, Mr. Foster, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, repudiated the idea because, said Mr. Foster, reciprocity had been a cardinal plank in the platform of the Conservative party for many years previously. It is therefore well to remember that both Mr. Tarte and Mr. Dobell, when they entered the Liberal cabinet had not for a long

time previously differed in opinion with the Liberal Prime Minister, but that on the contrary they were in entire accord with him on all matters of public policy and on all matters of minor policy as well.

Previous speakers on this side of the House have pointed out the line of cleavage between the present ministers on the navy question, and it may be interesting to pursue that subject a little further so that we may understand fully how and when these differences of opinion arose. It is true that the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and their parliamentary followers adhered to the resolution of March 29, 1909, for several months after that resolution was unanimously adopted by this House. In proof of that you have had cited the speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Borden in England on the 15 of July, 1909, as well as the speech he delivered at Halifax on the 14th of October of that year, after his return from England. There is, however, another speech which has not been referred to so far in the debate and that is a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on April 18, 1909, in the city of Toronto, before the Centre and South Toronto Conservative clubs. A despatch from Toronto to the Montreal 'Gazette,' dated April 18, 1909, says:

George E. Foster urged that a beginning be made in the formation of a navy of our own as well as taking steps to assist Great Britain in the defence of Canada. He concluded by urging that Canada should let the roots sink down into her own soil and gradually lay the foundation of a navy of our own.

And when you hear these words quoted to-day in recognize them as an old friend, because they are practically the same words used by the same hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in the eloquent speech he delivered in this House on the 29th March, 1909, in support of the resolution which he and his party now profess to disregard.

It has been said that the Prime Minister and his English speaking followers adhered to this resolution until the result of the Drummond-Arthurs election became known, and that then a change took place. This, however, is not an absolutely correct statement of the situation. Prior to the Drummond-Arthurs election there were developments in the direction of change in another direction, in regard to some information may, I think, very properly be given to this House. You have heard in the course of this debate the statement that it was pressure from Toronto that caused the Prime Minister to abandon his position on the navy question. I am not disputing the question any honour that Toronto may be entitled to in this regard, but to do it justice I must say that the pressure, in this instance, came not from Toronto, but from the city of Winnipeg and from no less a person than the former Minister of Public Works in the Manitoba government, now the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers) in this coalition cabinet. The first intimation the public had that such pressure might be expected was contained in a despatch from