

Referring to the contribution, my honourable friend from Rimouski exclaimed: 'That \$35,000,000 which we are to give, we will borrow it, and where?' If my hon. friend had read through the Navy Bill, he would be satisfied that there will be no loan. Clause 2 of the Bill reads thus:

That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding thirty-five million dollars for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire.

So, in accordance with the Bill, we are to build three ships which will be the property of the Canadian people and which are to be put at the disposal of the British Admiralty to defend, to protect Canada and the Empire. But even under the supposition that the Canadian Government must borrow that amount, and that this loan must be negotiated on the British market, we should not lose sight of the fact that these funds will in no way be supplied by the British people or by the British Government.

I may be allowed to quote the following words: 'London is the greatest receptacle wherein flows the riches from the five parts of the world, capital taking naturally the direction of the most powerful and best protected nations. It is German, Jewish, Russian or Spanish gold which is offered on the money markets of the Mother Country; and that travelling and cosmopolitan power which capital is, has nothing to do with the taxes levied on the British people or with the maintenance of its navy.'

I said: Even under the supposition that a loan should be negotiated; but, such a loan cannot be negotiated, clause 2 of the Bill saying expressly: 'From and out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.' So then, to my mind, it is endeavouring to mislead this House to say or give to understand that we are going to make a gift of \$35,000,000 to those very people from whom we are to borrow that amount.

At a time when the farming and industrial classes are insisting on gradual disarmament, is it not important to postpone the hour when Canada will have to adopt a permanent naval policy? At this so critical hour in our nation's history, when the Prime Minister exclaims: 'We have an immense heritage,' when the hon. Postmaster General exclaims, 'We will some day be the centre of the Empire,' I say we should ponder. Before voting in favour of the policy of the Liberal party, before undertaking the construction of two fleet units which may cost fifty or seventy-five million dollars; before depriving Canadian agriculture and industry of the labour which is their mainstay. I think we should develop the vast territories at our disposal; I think we should extend our trade and give an impetus to our industries; I think we should take advantage of our agricultural,

forest and mining wealth. And, on the other hand, I think the people should be consulted before we decide on a permanent policy.

To obtain that result, to ensure the prosperity of our farming and industrial classes, to afford all classes of society an opportunity of prospering and aggrandizing themselves, I am disposed, as suggested by the Prime Minister of Canada, to lend a hand in strengthening the prestige of the Mother Country.

People of my kin and kith, newspapermen, satisfied that their views are orthodox, act as if they had a monopoly of patriotism, and seem incapable of taking any stock in the good intentions of their opponents. To their mind, our political leaders are concerned only in the spoils. I hold no brief to defend the men entrusted with the destinies of the Liberal or of the Conservative party; but I repudiate with the utmost energy all those slanders thrown at the head of representatives of the people who conscientiously are carrying out their mandate. However, there are newspapermen, people of my kin and kith, who think they are the sole depositories of the pure principles of civics and politics, who brand us as traitors because we abide by the dictates of our conscience. I deny to these newspapermen, whether their name be Bourassa, Lavergne or Héroux, to brand us as renegades.

In approving Mr. Borden's policy, I remain faithful to the traditions handed down by our forerunners. As was so well said by the hon. Postmaster General: 'In the early days of the British régime, when the Mother Country was passing through a critical period, the French and British agreed to start a subscription towards collecting an amount which would be sent to the Mother Country as their humble contribution in connection with her wars.' To those who speak of intimidation, corruption and treason, I recall the noble attitude of the leaders of my church, who have not hesitated undergoing heavy sacrifices in order to ensure the prestige of Great Britain in the hour of danger; and I prefer following the leaders of my church rather than the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), who betrayed his people in 1896—

Mr. GAUVREAU: (Translation.) I rise to a point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: (Mr. Blondin): (Translation.) I believe the hon. member is making use of terms which are not allowable under the rules; the word betrayal is not permissible under the rules of the House.

Mr. GAUVREAU: (Translation.) I ask that the member for L'Islet withdraw that word. Of course, I pardon him, Mr. Speaker, and you know why: Weep on yourselves, oh daughters of Jerusalem—