

country and to declare that in future when a successful political leader is called upon to form a cabinet and finds himself embarrassed by the complexity of his support, he may, in the selection of his ministers, disregard their opposing views on all matters of public policy, provided that upon one question only they agree—namely the necessity, in the interest of their party, of keeping their opponents out of office. In effect, that is the position taken in this debate by members of the present coalition and by hon. gentlemen who have spoken in their behalf; and that position, I have no doubt, all the factions supporting this government are prepared to maintain.

Such a course, I submit, is without precedent in this Dominion. But it is not the only strange spectacle presented by this coalition. For the first time in the history of responsible government in any British country we have in Canada to-day a government whose leader does not occupy a seat in either branch of parliament and who, therefore, is not responsible to the people to whom the government which he leads is responsible. The titular leader of the government is, of course, my hon. friend the Prime Minister; the actual leader of the government is Mr. Henri Bourassa, the editor of 'Le Devoir,' and head of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. But, Sir, even that does not fully describe the situation as to the leadership of this government. The Prime Minister receives his orders not from Mr. Bourassa direct, but from either of his deputies, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) or Mr. Armand Lavergne, so that the titular leader sits not once but twice or thrice removed from the real seat of power.

Mr. Speaker, no greater tribute could be paid to Mr. Bourassa's political influence than his ascendancy over a party to which he never belonged, and in which, even now, he disdains membership. His success becomes all the more striking when you recall what was said about him and his party immediately after the general election by the 'Orange Sentinel,' of Toronto, a newspaper whose unwavering support of the Conservative party gives it authority to speak for that party. In its issue of 28th September last, the 'Sentinel' published a long article reviewing the election, in which it said:

Nationalist Party to Remain Independent of Borden Government.

Mr. Bourassa has declared his independence of the new government about to be formed. That is quite satisfactory. He will continue, he says, to fight for the principles for which he has struggled. Those principles, as he has explained them in his speeches, can have no support from the Borden government without alienating the people of Ontario. The Nationalist propaganda is a menace to the integrity of the empire. We have not hesitated

Mr. MURPHY.

to express our opinion of the movement or its leader. Our opposition to Sir Wilfrid Laurier was due to his surrender to the Ultramontanes. Bourassa's complaint against him was that he had not gone far enough in the service of his race and his church. The 'Sentinel' believes he went too far.

Certainly if Laurier did not go far enough to please Mr. Bourassa, there is nothing in Mr. Borden's record to encourage him to hope for greater docility to the wishes of the Nationalists. It suits our views to have Mr. Bourassa standing aloof. Let him fight his battle in Quebec. He may have some success there. But he must understand that the harder he fights for the extension of the privileges of the French in the Dominion the more solidly will the English-speaking electors gather behind the man who resists him. If Mr. Bourassa reads the returns intelligently he will discover that for the first time since confederation there is a government at Ottawa that is in a position to defy the agitators of Quebec. That is the outstanding feature of the contest. It is one which is most gratifying to the dominant race in Canada. It means, in a phrase, that the rule of the minority will cease. The tradition that a party could not win a federal election without the aid of Quebec has been destroyed. So far as Mr. Bourassa has contributed to fix that in the minds of politicians and people he has done a real service.

Brave words, Mr. Speaker, but eaten almost as soon as they were uttered. Fond hopes, Mr. Speaker, but rudely dashed on the ground almost as soon as they were formed. For Mr. Bourassa, with a better knowledge than the 'Sentinel' of the man with whom he had to deal, laughed at the 'Sentinel's' threats, pressed his advantage, and to-day stands in the pilot-house of the government ship, with his hand upon the wheel, steering the craft to an anchorage from which he and his fellow Nationalists are determined there shall go forth no Canadian navy and no contribution to the British navy.

It has been frequently asserted in the course of this debate that no constitutional model can be found for such a coalition government as the one we have at present. Where then did the Prime Minister go for his model? So far he has not told us, but as he is a gentleman of culture and widely read, he must have found somewhere laid down, a model which he decided to follow. All the signs indicate that the Prime Minister's reading led him to take for his model a form of government which prevailed on this continent at a time when the Red man was supreme. In the absence of information from the Prime Minister it is difficult to be exact but those who remember Parkman's account of the organization of the Iroquois confederacy will notice a striking parallel between that body and the make-up of the present cabinet. Parkman tells us that, sundered by dissensions the Iroquois