

and I are hand-in-hand in opposition to Laurier's silly naval policy. I give him, as your representative, the keys to the whole north Ontario district.'

Finally Mr. Bourassa himself assured the people that the Opposition had remodelled its naval policy in accordance with the position of Mr. Monk, with an appeal to the electors, and accordingly he was lending his aid to their cause.

By way of parenthesis, let me add, that the reference that Mr. Bourassa made in that speech to the remodelling of his policy by the then leader of the Opposition was due to the fact that the day before this meeting the then leader of the Opposition, now the right hon. the leader of the Government, issued his second election manifesto, and in that manifesto he took a new position on the navy, a position which the *Montreal Star*, the chief of his present hysterical brigade, described as magnificent on the negative side, but which Mr. Bourassa described as being so entirely in accordance with the policy of Mr. Monk with an appeal to the electors that he was supporting it. All the pledges as to consulting the people that were given before the election were repeated after the election. They were repeated with special emphasis in the counties of Jacques Cartier and Quebec when the late hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) sought election in these constituencies. The statements that were made on this occasion have been presented to the House over and over again and I need not repeat them to-day. I will however ask you to bear further in mind that, although the subject of the navy was referred to many times last session, no intimation was ever given to this House or to the country, that the Prime Minister and his then colleague, the then Minister of Public Works, were not still at one upon the question of consulting the people before deciding either upon a contribution or a permanent naval policy.

That state of affairs continued up to the month of October last when the then Minister of Public Works resigned. In resigning, he gave to the public a statement that the reason for his resignation was that the Government had decided to give a contribution and that as he was pledged to consult the people before such a step was taken, he felt in honour bound to resign his portfolio. The letter of resignation written by Mr. Monk contained such an important contradiction of the statements made to this House by the Prime Minister on the 5th of December last when introducing his naval proposals that it makes the necessity for ministerial explanations absolutely imperative. You will recall, Sir, that in his speech of the 5th of December, the Prime Minister read as a part of that speech the memorandum from the Admiralty, and he stated that the Gov-

ernment had reached the decision to give this \$35,000,000 contribution after they had considered the facts set forth in that memorandum. In other words, that the receipt and consideration of this memorandum were the determining factors with the Government in arriving at their decision. What are the facts? The letter of resignation written by Mr. Monk proves conclusively that the Government reached a decision to give this \$35,000,000 contribution more than two weeks before they could positively have had that memorandum in their hands. Let me adduce the proof of that. The letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies transmitting this memorandum is dated Downing Street, 25th October, 1912. Allowing eight or nine days for this document to reach Ottawa, it could not have been here before the 2nd or 3rd of November at the earliest. Now, the letter of resignation sent by the late Minister of Public Works to his leader is dated October 18, 1912, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the first sentence in that letter:

My Dear Premier:—I regret to find that I cannot concur in the decision arrived at by the Cabinet yesterday.

You will note that the 'yesterday' referred to in the letter was October 17.

To place on behalf of Canada an emergency contribution of \$35,000,000 at the disposal of the British Government for naval purposes with the sanction of Parliament but without giving the Canadian people an opportunity of expressing their approval of this important step before it is taken.

There you have conclusive proof that while this memorandum could not possibly have been in the hands of the Government until November the 2nd or 3rd at the earliest, Mr. Monk in his letter of resignation states that the decision to give \$35,000,000 was reached October 17, 1912, at least two weeks before the Government had the document upon which their whole case is founded. Now, Sir, what hon. gentlemen, in the face of these facts, will stand up in this House and seriously ask us to take the word of the Prime Minister upon this or any other subject? I submit, Sir, that the case against the Government in this regard is absolutely unanswerable; I submit that unless the Prime Minister is to be branded in a way which the rules of the House will not permit me to designate, he should defer the further consideration of this measure until his late colleague the Minister of Public Works is in his place in this House to give us the opportunity of hearing from him the real reason of his resignation from the Cabinet.

The situation which is disclosed by these conflicting statements between the late Minister of Public Works and the Prime Minister gives colour to the state-