

there was Mr. Grégoire, a bright young man from Disraeli, and I could name a dozen others. If the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) were here he could tell you about young Mr. Loranger from Montreal, who was out in that district. He did not talk in favour of the present leader of the Government, he was against him; his leader was Mr. Monk, he had nothing to do with Mr. Borden and nothing to do with Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The handbook goes on:

—it may be placed by the Government at the disposal of the Admiralty for general service in the Royal navy. If this is done when Parliament is not in session, then Parliament is to be summoned within fifteen days to approve of the Government's action.

In other words, if the Government does not choose to have the Canadian navy take part in an Imperial war, Parliament will not be summoned, and will not be in a position to force the Government.

That appeared in the Conservative handbook, which was circulated in the English-speaking provinces, and which was intended for the English-speaking Conservatives who could carry it around in their satchels. I had a good friend in the Conservative party who passed it to me, because he said he was ashamed of it. He said: Mr. Tobin, I do not want to belong to a party that has one policy for one part of the country and another policy for another part. Then it goes on:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved the second reading of this Bill on February 3. He declared that the policy of the Government was in perfect accord with the terms of the resolution adopted in March, 1909, and ought therefore to command Conservative support. He defended his attitude at the conference on the ground that Canadian autonomy must not be impaired. That the Canadian navy would not be lent by the Government to take part in all British wars, he made clear when he said: 'If England is at war, we are at war and liable to attack. I do not say we shall always be attacked, neither do I say that we shall take part in all the wars of England.'

Here is the Conservative party's position:

What was and is the position of the Conservative party on this question of naval defence? It was clearly and unequivocally defined by Mr. R. L. Borden, the Conservative leader, speaking on the third reading of the Laurier Bill, April, 20, 1910. Mr. Borden said:—What I contend for is the principle that in time of war there shall be one united naval force for the whole Empire, and that naval force shall be available to meet any enemy that may assault the integrity of the Empire.

How can the right hon. leader of the Government claim he has a mandate from the people, he never discussed or mentioned the subject to the people. In Sherbrooke, he did not explain that his policy was a con-

tribution of \$35,000,000. Further on Mr. Borden said:

It may be fairly asked what we would do if we were in power to-day with regard to a great question of this kind. It seems to me that our plain course and duty would be this: The Government of this country are able to understand and to know, if they take the proper action for that purpose, whether the conditions which face the Empire at this time in respect to naval defence are grave. If we were in power, we would endeavour to find that out, to get a plain, unvarnished answer to that question, and if the answer to the question, based upon the report of the Government of the Mother Country and of the naval experts of the Admiralty were such—and I think it would be such—as to demand instant and effective action by this country, then I would appeal to Parliament for immediate and effective aid, if Parliament did not give immediate and effective aid I would appeal to the people of this country.

He did not say that if he could not get his Bill through he would put the gag on the representatives of the people of this country in order to get it through. He said he would appeal to the country. I ask him, why does he not appeal to the country? That is what he promised, according to the Liberal-Conservative handbook of 1911. I have always taken the right hon. gentleman at his word, and I think the people of the province of Quebec and of the Dominion generally expected that he would carry out his promise. He did not follow the example of the Liberal party in 1911. When the question of reciprocity was under consideration, the leader of the Government at that time did not apply the gag; he dissolved the House, and accepted the verdict of the people. These \$35,000,000 mean a good deal to Canada. In 1911 we were spending about \$7,000,000 on the militia; this year we are spending \$11,000,000 and in addition we are to spend \$35,000,000 on three dreadnoughts. If I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries rightly when he spoke a few days ago, he was satisfied that we would not be able to build the ships less than \$40,000,000 or \$45,000,000. If the Government are going to spend this money why not spend it in this country? The labourers, the mechanics, the farmers, the merchants, and the manufacturers, want this money to be spent in Canada. I would be very sorry to see such a large amount of money go to England or to any other country. I am a British subject, but first of all I am a Canadian, and I stand by Canadian policies. We are spending \$2,500,000 on agriculture, and a Bill was put through the House the other night providing for an expenditure of \$10,000,000 during the next ten years, or \$1,000,000 every year, so that we will be spending \$50,000,000 including the amounts for the militia and the dreadnoughts. That means a tax of seven dollars