

home rule next month. If blood had not been thicker than water, the Papineaus, the Vigers, the Taschereau's the Lafontaines, the Cartiers, the Dorions, and all those other great men, would not have been able to give us the privileges which we enjoy to-day, and hon. members from the province of Quebec would not have been able to speak their own French language in this House a fact which nobody would have regretted more than my hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham).

What are the general purposes of these resolutions which have been brought before the House. To stop freedom of speech? To stop freedom of speech and no doubt more particularly with reference to this very question which is now before the people, a question in regard to which every freedom and liberty of discussion should be given. This question is more important than that of Confederation, and its discussions in which our forefathers engaged, whether in Quebec or in the Maritime provinces, the Howes and those other great men, because it means striking at the precious right of free speech for which they fought and which may be lost forever to this country if this measure is carried. We are told that we have abused freedom of speech and that we have endeavoured to prevent this Naval Aid Bill from passing. We are told that we have stopped public business. When did we stop public business. As it has been stated and repeated in this House, every time Supply has been asked we have given Supply. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) offered one-sixth of the Estimates without discussion, or the necessary amount to carry on the business of the country for the next two months, and yet hon. gentlemen say we have interfered with public business. What has been our purpose? The purpose has been to prevent the passage of a law providing for a contribution of \$35,000,000 to England and for what? We were told at first it was a gift to England in a moment of emergency five months ago. During that five months England has been waiting, attending to other business, and was not this Opposition perfectly within its rights in endeavouring, by all possible means at its command under the principle of freedom of speech, and by virtue of our parliamentary procedure, to prevent the passage of such a law, not in the mere spirit of obstruction as some hon. members, as well as some of the newspapers, on the Government side are trying to convey to the public mind, but with a loyal and patriotic purpose and from the sincere conviction that such an Act should not be recorded at this one session. We and particularly our leaders, are supposed to be gifted with sufficient intelligence, with sufficient knowledge, to know that with

Mr. TURGEON.

time developments will come that will justify the action of the Opposition who claim to represent the majority of the people on this question. At the moment their representatives happen to be in the minority in this House, but they would not be in the minority, as we know, if hon. members from the province of Quebec, elected chiefly to oppose the measure which is before the House to-day, and to secure the passage of which closure is now proposed, had been faithful to their mandate and promises, as the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) has been, and voted with the Opposition. We believe that we represent the majority of the people of the country and it is the duty as well as the right of the majority to enforce as far as possible their opinions upon the members of the Opposition—the temporary opposition—and endeavour to bring about delay by every justifiable and constitutional means at their command pending further developments because, since we have undertaken to delay the coming into effect of this measure, we have had developments which have justified more and more the Opposition without a single justification on the Government side. We have had expressions from the country, we have had expressions from Australia commending the people of the Dominion of Canada for the stand which they have taken and urging Canada to carry out her agreement made with Australia in 1911 by which Canada was to have built her own Canadian navy and taken charge of the trade routes on the Pacific. Australia has proceeded with the construction of her own navy and to-day expects that the Parliament of Canada will, before the end of this session, come to the decision of putting into effect our part of that agreement. We have had expressions from the other side of the ocean to the effect that the Laurier policy in favour of a Canadian navy is the best one suited to the interests of the Empire as well as the interests of Canada. Convinced as we are to-day by the expression of opinion in London and England as well as in Australia and other places, was it not our right as well as our duty to postpone the passage of the Bill proposed by the Government? Notwithstanding the condition in which we are threatened to be placed by this last Act of the Government, we expect that within one or two months the people of Canada will have expressed their opinion strongly enough that the Parliament of Canada will not sanction the Bill which for the purpose of passing this new resolution is placed before the House.

As I said a short time ago, I would be surprised to see all my compatriots on the other side of the House rising in their seats to vote for this tyrannical resolution, after the appeal of their old chief, the ex-