

Minister of Public Works to the right hon. the Prime Minister, but that letter, may I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, deals only with what happened when the member for Jacques Cartier went out of the Cabinet. The matter of real interest to Parliament, and to the country, a matter that should be put within the knowledge of Parliament and the country, is what happened when he went into the Cabinet. We naturally ask ourselves, were he and his leader then in accord upon this naval question? We assume that they were. If that is correct, then, Sir, the right hon. the Prime Minister must have changed since then. He has not offered the House or the country any explanation on that score, and I assume he will not do so. But the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) could give us an explanation, and no doubt he would do so if his state of health permitted him to return to Parliament. Such an explanation is, I submit, Mr. Speaker, absolutely necessary before we can have that knowledge of the whole situation, without which it is impossible to properly discuss the proposals of the Government, and without which we should not be asked to discuss those proposals. Now, in the absence of that explanation, the only way in which we can arrive at some knowledge of the relations that have existed between the right hon. the Prime Minister and his late colleague, and between the two wings of their supporters, is by referring to the records in which these relations are disclosed, and that I propose to do as briefly as possible.

The first occasion on which the right hon. the Prime Minister publicly identified himself with the naval policy of the member for Jacques Cartier was when in November, 1910, during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, he voted for the amendment introduced by the member for Jacques Cartier. That amendment has already been read to the House, but in view of its importance, I crave the privilege of reading it again. It was in these terms:

The House regrets that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to Imperial armaments.

So far as we in the House know, and so far as the public outside know, the vote that the present Prime Minister gave in support of that amendment marked the first time that he had publicly signified his adherence to the policy of the

leader of the Nationalists within Parliament, a policy which declared that no action should be taken, either with regard to a contribution, or with regard to a permanent naval policy, until the people were consulted. That marked the beginning, as I have said, of the alliance between the Prime Minister and the member for Jacques Cartier on this subject. Now, the alliance, of which that vote was the evidence, that took place within the walls of Parliament, was duplicated by another alliance in the country between the Nationalist and Conservative wings of the party supporting the present Prime Minister. The alliance continued to grow closer and closer, and eventually, when the general elections were brought on, it was found that the Conservative candidates in the province of Quebec who sought to get the Nationalist vote in their respective constituencies were obliged to sign a pledge, which became known as the Nationalist pledge in that campaign. That pledge, for instance, formed part of the election address issued by the Conservative candidate in the county of Shefford, in the province of Quebec, Mr. James Davidson. As set out in his election address, it read as follows:

I declare that if I am elected on the 21st of September next, I shall work and vote against any prime minister of whatever party he may be who shall continue the actual policy of the navy as voted in 1910, without having previously given to the Canadian people the occasion of pronouncing themselves upon this question by way of plebiscite or special referendum.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend says hear, hear. I am glad that there is at least one hon. member on the Government side of the House, who adheres to the pledge, from which his leader has ever since run away. Now, this pledge, as contained in the election address of Mr. Davidson, in the county of Shefford, was similar in terms to a like pledge signed by Dr. Pickell, the Conservative candidate in the county of Missisquoi, and which formed part of that gentleman's election address. An important incident connected with these Nationalist pledges is that the Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, set the seal of his approval on them by appearing on the same platforms with Mr. Davidson and Dr. Pickell, and speaking in their support at Granby and Bedford, in the counties of Shefford and Missisquoi on August 30th, 1911. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the then leader of the Opposition, now the right hon. the Prime Minister, publicly committed himself to the policy of consulting the people before doing anything, either by way of contribu-