

go back on the manly policy which they had advocated, to go back on the logical policy which they advocated, and to do something else—anything at all as long as it was opposed to the principles and the policy of the then government. Then came the memorable resolution of my hon. friend the premier in which he advocated a contribution of \$25,000,000, and this went on very well, and the Conservative party seemed to be pretty well agreed upon that, until the Drummond and Arthabaska election took place in the autumn of 1910. And since the Drummond and Arthabaska election was carried by the Nationalists we commence to see the fusion—I might almost say the agreement, and, as has been stated by the right hon. the leader of the opposition the unholy alliance—which was entered into, which evidently must have been entered into before then, between the then leader of the opposition and present premier, and the leader of the Nationalist party in the province of Quebec. Perhaps my hon. friends will deny now, as they did a year ago, that such an alliance existed,

We say on this side of the House that at that time that alliance did exist between the Nationalist party and the then leader of the opposition. My hon. friend the premier denounced this statement in almost angry terms and we had it denounced from every platform in the country as well as in parliament. We were compelled to take the word of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), we were compelled to treat it as though no coalition existed. But, Sir, from the day that the Drummond and Arthabaska election was carried by the Nationalists down to the present time, I ask the hon. members of this House, and I ask the people of this country, can they point to a solitary circumstance that has not shown in the plainest manner possible that that alliance did exist, that it existed down to the very day of the elections on the 21st September, and that it was consummated by admitting into the government the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and the two gentlemen whom he says he chose as his colleagues acting under the authority of the Prime Minister. Now we have here three gentlemen who represent the party which is avowedly opposed—I do not know that I can put my hands on the actual words of the Minister of Public Works in which he will say that he is opposed, absolutely opposed, to contributing anything to the naval defence of the empire; but, Sir, take the statements which have been made by that hon. gentleman all through the province of Quebec during the last year and a half. Take his admission made here in this House about a year ago when he confessed that he had preached in every meeting in the province of Quebec which he and his

friends had held during the preceding summer that the logical conclusion of a naval policy such as we had, meant conscription and, therefore, they opposed it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) admitted that it meant conscription. He said that it could not be anything else, and he and his friends preached that doctrine everywhere. And then take the impassioned appeal made to the people of the province of Quebec by his leader, and by the actual master of the present administration, Mr. Henri Bourassa, and his lieutenant Mr. Armand Lavergne, and the rest of the Nationalists in that province. Take the impassioned appeals which they made to the mothers of the province of Quebec, not to have their sons taken away to be disembowelled by German shells. Then take the impassioned appeals and the impassioned remarks—my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) denies that he is the author of them—but take the impassioned appeals of one Nationalist who said that it was necessary to shoot holes in the British flag in order to breathe the air of freedom. These were the arguments used by hon. gentlemen on the other side, these were the arguments used in the Drummond and Arthabaska election, these were the arguments used last summer, these were the arguments used on every platform in the province of Quebec during the late campaign, and it was on these arguments that hon. gentlemen on the other side were elected. And now my hon. friend the leader of the government, and his friends around him are sitting on the treasury benches by virtue of the assistance which they received from the men who obtained their election in the manner in which I have described. So, Sir, I say that we have the right to come here and protest against the inclusion of these men in the cabinet. Not that they are not gentlemen unfit to sit in any cabinet, I have nothing to say against them in their personal capacity, I am only criticising them on account of what they represent, and the views which have brought them into the government, views by which this country will be governed I am afraid as long as this government remains in power. My hon. friend the leader of the government says: 'We will frame our naval policy in good time, and as we have a mind to.'

And the question comes to us now: What is that policy to-day? The hon. gentleman and his friends said in 1909: We believe in the manly policy of self-defence by Canada, the creation of a Canadian navy, the training of our own men, and the placing of ourselves in a position to protect our own shores and our own commerce, and, in time