

by my vote that very appropriate motion which he presented to this House in regard to the curse of patronage. That curse I think, explains the apparent indifference and the alleged acquiescence which we find among those hon. members who come from my own province of Quebec, because I know what is their private opinion upon this subject. I say more. As long as that curse exists and is maintained by this government, as long as we have here men who hold promises of position, and who have held out to them the prospect of petty grants of money to be made within the limits of their county, so long shall we not see in this parliament that free expression of opinion which we find in the British parliament at the present time.

But, let me particularize, because, although I want to be as brief as possible and merely upon this occasion lay some of my views in support of my opinions before the House, I will not on that account diminish what I have to say upon these preliminary and important points. From the beginning of this controversy the organs of my right hon. friend in the province of Quebec have laid before the public what seems to me to be absolutely the contrary to what this Bill and this policy are. I could quote from the accredited organs of my right hon. friend. I could quote from other newspapers in my own province, which, although they are not the properly accredited organs of the government, have been brought by influences which I suspect, but the extent of which I do not know, to support in a general way the policy of a Canadian navy. My quotations in that respect might be infinite in number. Let me quote an article published a few days ago, on the 29th January last, in 'Le Canada,' my right hon. friend's own organ in the city of Montreal, upon this question, and let the members of this House judge whether this exposition is a truthful one, is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. After enumerating what this newspaper calls the diversified views of the opposition, after having given us the views of the Conservative members from the west, given us their own private, individual view, or what purports to be the view, of the leader of the opposition, and after having given a garbled view, an insincere and untrue aspect, of what it calls the Monk-Bourassa policy, it goes on—I will not detain the House with it—to tell us what is the policy of the government. I will give it in English:

Canada must gradually take charge of the defence of its own territory on land and on sea.

It refers to New Zealand and Australia, and continues:

We are less exposed and we have no business to prepare a defence against attack from the United States, our friends and allies. A powerful hostile fleet could not attack up coming from Europe without having vanquished the imperial fleet—an impossible contingency. Therefore, we are only exposed to raids of hostile cruisers, isolated, or, at least, very few in number, that would have been left outside of any naval concentration to run upon the seas and harass British commerce. Therefore, we must indeed content ourselves with rapid cruisers and torpedo boat destroyers small vessels armed to attack, and whose extreme rapidity enables them to elude pursuit.

I may say to my right hon. friend that what he called some days ago the shivering electors of Jacques Cartier are indignant at this expression.

Therefore, we must do something in order to bear the burden of British defence. This something we will do in full harmony with the British admiralty by constructing ships for our own defence, if needed. These ships will be at our expense and under our control, but if we are asked for them we may—

'may' is marked in specially heavy type.

—lend them to Great Britain. The imperial authorities accept this programme with gratitude, as representing our full share of the imperial defence.

First point.

Our fleet being essentially defensive, we do not cause any damage to anybody, and our act is as far from militarism as the organization of a police force differs from the creation of a permanent army which is destined for the offensive.

Second point.

This navy we are constructing will not in any way cause us any expense to this extent that we will not be obliged to borrow a single cent.

Third point.

Our readers have here, shorn of all useless verbosity, of all declamation, of all appeals to public sentiment, the exact expression of the four policies that have been produced in Canada on this question of an imperial navy.

This has been dinned into the ears of our population for months, and I ask the House again: Is this the true expression of the policy that underlies this Bill along with the authentic conclusions arrived at by the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909 which we are now about to carry out? In the same city, but speaking to different readers upon the same subject, what do we find in another organ of my right hon. friend, the Montreal 'Herald'? Commenting upon the very able speech delivered in Montreal some days ago by a gentleman who was formerly