

their proposals for the future legislation of the country without saying one word as to what they propose to do regarding the construction of the proposed Canadian navy. If it be true that in the past members of the government were diametrically opposed one to the other, is it not fair to the people of Canada that they should know how they stand on the great question of naval defence for our shores, our homes and our empire? Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in saying that I shall heartily support the amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. GEORGE H. BOIVIN (Shefford). Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will pardon the youngest member of His Majesty's loyal opposition, if he takes up a few moments of the time of this House and adds a few words to the many able addresses which we have heard in the course of the debate upon the amendment proposed to the motion that a humble address be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne. I should perhaps speak in French, but I will use the English language in order that I may be understood, not only by you, Sir, but by every one here present. I do not think that I can add much to what has been said by my right hon. leader and the other gentlemen who have preceded me, but I feel that I should give you as best I can, my reasons for voting in favour of the proposed amendment. The new government has succeeded in composing a speech from the Throne which, in the words of the Montreal Daily 'Star,' sounds well but means little. It mentions the prosperity of our country, and thus gives a deserved tribute of praise to the late government. It mentions improved trade relations with the British West Indies and British Guiana. We need little of their produce, they need none of ours, and I believe that the proposed improved trade relations will not take shape during the present session. Good roads are also mentioned, and the Canadian farmer is assured that he will not be forgotten. After the fiercest election campaign in the history of the Dominion of Canada, waged and won with the object of preventing that same farmer from selling his produce in the nearest, largest, and best market he could possibly desire, it will be impossible to compensate him for what he has lost by the defeat of the late Liberal administration.

The creation of a permanent tariff commission is also announced. It may be an excellent thing, and it may not; but until we know how it is composed and what powers it will have, I do not wish to enter into discussion upon it. But that is all we find in the speech from the Throne. What about the school question in Manitoba and the

new provinces, which was hashed and re-hashed for the purpose of getting votes in the province of Quebec? What about the Ne Temere decree which was used by hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House for the purpose of getting votes in the province of Ontario? What about the pet hobby of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), when he occupied a seat on the left of the Speaker as the member for Jacques Cartier, the Georgian Bay canal? What about the Canadian navy, that navy which, according to the opposition speakers in the last election, was so infernally imperial in Quebec, and so damnably disloyal in the other provinces? Will the navy law be repealed, and what law will replace it? The speech from the Throne says not a word about these matters upon which the people of Canada would like to be enlightened.

Still the government is surprised to think we have anything to find fault with. The Minister of Public Works says that there is nothing to worry about. It is true, that Canada has been so well administered that it will continue to grow and prosper for years to come; but if this prosperity is to become permanent, the country must be governed by ministers who agree among themselves at least upon the great and important issues before the country. The same hon. minister told us the other day, 'We are here while you are there.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, he is there, the first lieutenant of the present Prime Minister, and parliament and the country have a right to know, how after advocating two different policies, and leading two different parties these two hon. gentlemen have buried their differences and have taken the two first positions in the government of this country.

I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of raising questions of race and creed because we found fault with the admission of three members of parliament from the province of Quebec into the Borden government. We did not mention race or creed. We would have regretted to see the province of Quebec ignored in the formation of the cabinet; but we expected to see the hon. the Prime Minister take from that province three able and competent French Canadians professing his own political faith and belonging to his own political party. We criticise him because he went outside of his party and chose three men, all able and competent, if you will, but who for years past have denounced and condemned his naval policy as being worse than that of the Laurier government. We criticise him because he took into his cabinet three followers of Henri Bourassa, whose newspaper, 'Le Devoir,' has, since the last election, but before the formation of the cabinet, published an article against the admission of the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), the Minister of