

called on to fulfil and never intended to fulfil if they were placed on the Treasury benches. I go farther and say that the hon. gentlemen opposite sit to the right of the Speaker because they deceived the people of Canada from one ocean to the other. If my hon. friends are so very confident that they have the country behind them for the way they have carried out their promises and pledges, when they had such a great invitation and temptation to go to the country a year ago why did they not go, and see if the people were of the same mind as the hon. gentlemen opposite said they were? I think actions speak louder than words. The reason is that the hon. gentlemen knew that the people of the Dominion of Canada have realized that they were fooled and deceived and hoodwinked in the election of 1911, and if they had had an opportunity a year ago or to-day they would show their resentment of such deceiving election promises as were made to them. May we not take the navy as another illustration? These gentlemen in the province of Quebec not only put their money into the Nationalist election, but told all the Nationalists: If you vote for us against Laurier we will see to it that, in the very first session, the Navy Act is repealed. Was not that promise made by some twenty-one Nationalists who to-day have seats in this House and keep this Government in power, as straight and honest and honourable outwardly as a promise between man and man could be made, and has that ever been done? Did they not say they would resign if that was not done, and did they not, because of that, get more than twenty seats in the province of Quebec because those who to-day are following in the wake of this Imperialist jingo Government promised, if sent to Ottawa, that they would be even worse than Laurier in his opposition to the present Premier in his naval policy? The present Government, I say without fear of contradiction, hold their seats on the Treasury benches—and I say it in no spirit of desiring to say any more than I believe to be the truth—because they deceived and misled and befuddled the people of Canada and got their support under false pretences. My hon. friend who spoke last says that the present Prime Minister never promised this. No, he does not say that; he says it is not proved that he promised it. A year ago I read in the presence of the Prime Minister, on the occasion of the discussion on a certain amendment that I proposed to the Grain Act, the very promise which my hon. friend from Medicine Hat referred to to-day, in which the Prime

Minister said distinctly and categorically: 'If I am elected to office I will see that the lands are restored to the prairie provinces that were withheld in the autonomy legislation of 1905, or else one man will go out of public life.' I leave it to you as an impartial man, is there any fairness in that? Not a bit; it is quibbling and equivocating, and saying: Well, I am not tied up to that promise, because a man named Murray in Halifax says this or that about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say that such expressions as quibbling are not permissible in debate, and it would be well to avoid them. I could cite several decisions of Speakers to that effect.

Mr. KNOWLES: If the expression is unparliamentary I do not ask you to cite the cases; your word is as good as your bond. I did not know it was unparliamentary, and I, of course, withdraw it; but nothing will make me say that they did not quibble. I did not mean to use an unparliamentary term, and I withdraw the word; but the members have no doubt got the idea that I wish I had the power to put in more parliamentary language. The fact remains that to-day we are told that the lands are not restored to the prairie provinces, and to say that this is because a gentleman named George Murray says this and that and the other about it is something that to my mind is nothing but trifling with the question. Unless the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government can send a message to the people of the prairie provinces giving some better explanation than that for the non-fulfilment of that promise, the belief will be confirmed in the minds of the farmers of the prairie provinces that the right hon. gentleman never expected to carry out that promise, and never expected to be called upon to carry it out, and never intended to carry it out even if he were called upon to form a government. Their belief to-day is that the right hon. gentleman then was just offering them something as a sop and a bribe in place of his opposition to the proposed reciprocity legislation.

The hon. gentleman who spoke last says in one breath that there is no evidence of any promise, although, as I have said, the promise has been read twice in my hearing in the presence of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. He has never denied it. Here it is in a paper which I am sure the right hon. leader of the Govern-