

the party of honest men—the people have the right to know if it is his party which is holding the reins of power to-day; and if it be not, they are entitled to know what were the terms of the understanding by which that hon. gentleman consented to enter the cabinet.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to create the impression and started the legend that we on this side are dissatisfied simply because we are beaten. Not at all. We admit that the people voted against us and we abide by the decision of the people, but if the government, if the First Minister has rights and privileges, we on this side have rights and privileges and have duties to perform, and it is our duty to compel the government to state what were the terms of the agreement entered into with the Minister of Public Works and his party, because otherwise—if we take the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909, and if we take what has been said on the floor of this House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), we shall have to come to the conclusion that the government of the day has no policy at all on the naval question. Speaking for myself, it is my opinion no government in Canada should set aside a policy so important as that adopted on the naval question before being in a position to state to the country by what policy they were going to replace the one which they were setting aside.

The late government, in the eyes of its opponents, was a faulty government. That may be, but we claim that, in the management of the affairs of this country, it was loyal to the empire, it was loyal to Canada and true to its principles as set out in the platform of the Liberal convention in 1893.

I claim, Sir, that the late administration was loyal to the empire, and I think we have proved it. What was the government in power at the time of the South African war that was willing that the Canadian soldiers should go and fight for England on the African veldt? Was it not a Liberal government headed by a French Canadian, who our opponents claim was not loyal to the empire? I appeal to the members here who represent the voice of Toronto, and I am not ashamed to tell them that it was a French Canadian and Liberal Prime Minister who, without fear of prejudice, without fear of hatred, proposed to this country a naval policy which did justice to the empire, justice for the autonomy of this country, and justice for all our population, and who, when he went to defeat on that policy, fought like a man, and was defeated like a man. He does not deserve a single reproach, he does not feel a single remorse, and he went out of power with his party without regret, because that party fought like men, and were defeated like men.

Now, the Prime Minister stated that the late administration must have favoured

trusts, mergers and combines, because they existed before the 21st of September last. Well, I do not want to discuss that matter with the Prime Minister, but I think he is not doing justice to the people who fought with him in the recent campaign, in which the masses of the people were on one side with the Liberal party, while the trusts, mergers and combines were on the other side with the Conservative party. More than that: I claim that the late administration did its duty in fighting against the trusts. For instance, it enabled the Gall-Schneider Oil Company to fight the Standard Oil Company in 1897; it also fought the American Tobacco Company for the rights of the people.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the late administration reaped what had been sown by its predecessors. But if it was in the same country, with the same population, and the same policy, my hon. friend must admit that the late administration understood that policy, and the reeds of the population better than his own party did, because the late administration increased the population, the trade, and the wealth of this country and had surpluses all along, whereas our opponents had deficits during the 18 years of their administration.

Now, I come to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. He says he was a Conservative; but, Sir, everybody who followed him or met him on the platform in the last campaign must remember that he stated all over the province of Quebec that he had severed his connection with the party that is now in power, and with the chief of that party, that he had denied to the hon. member who now leads the government the right to give him orders and commands.

Mr. CODERRE. Will the hon. member please tell me where he met Mr. Monk personally during the last campaign?

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). Yes, I met him in the town of Lachine, at Cote St. Paul, and at the town of St. Laurent.

Mr. CODERRE. Do you declare on your honour as a member of this House that the statements which you have put in Mr. Monk's mouth were uttered by him on those occasions?

Mr. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe). The declarations made by the hon. Minister of Public Works were not made in a Tory parish, or in the manufacturing centre of Cote St. Paul; but in the parish of St. Laurent, those were the words he used. During the campaign of Drummond and Arthabaska I met the hon. Minister of Public Works on nomination day at Drummondville, and what did he say there? That he did not want any navy for Canada at all, that he was against the navy,