

a result of those promises and pledges moved in that direction.

My hon. friend from Dorchester, however, on February 7, 1912, gave notice of a resolution for the repeal of the Naval Bill; but the hon. member knew at that date, as every member in the House, that his resolution could not be taken into consideration, the House having at the time carried a motion giving precedence to Government measures over all others until the end of the session.

Nevertheless, I may point out that, in view of the vote given last week by the hon. member, the main reason alleged in the notice of motion to justify the repeal of the Naval Bill, is that it outlines a policy the importance and consequences of which are very great, and the provisions of which have not, previous to their enacting, been submitted to the people.

Of the hon. member for Dorchester, as well as of his fellow-members, I have the right to say: "How is it that this pure gold has been changed into vile lead?" The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries declared in the course of the session that members of the Government would proceed to London to consult the Admiralty in order to learn of the best means whereby Canada might assist in the naval defence.

The hon. member for Yamaska, who is no doubt in possession of some inside information, stated in his speech of February 13th instant:

Four of the members of the Cabinet have crossed the Atlantic for that purpose. At the time of their leaving they were in favour of a contribution; they were similarly disposed on their return.

Then this view of the hon. member for Yamaska is confirmed unmistakably by the following words which appear in the memo of the Admiralty:

The Prime Minister of Canada having enquired in what form immediate assistance on his part would be most effective. . .

The hon. Postmaster General, as his colleague, was willing to grant a contribution. He realized fully, however, the singularity of his position, and the Government organs in the province of Quebec announced that my hon. friend was going over to the Old Country, not to confer with the Admiralty, but to improve his health which was not of the best.

Why was not the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, the recognized leader of the Nationalist wing of the cabinet, taken along on that diplomatic trip? Have we not reason to surmise that the Prime Minister, on that occasion as well, was showing very good judgment, and, in the person of the hon. Postmaster General, had chosen a more accommodating partner? The present proposals are the outcome of that trip.

And I say to-day to the Government, I say more particularly to our Quebec representatives in the cabinet: What have become of your pledges? As insolvent business men you have failed to carry out your most solemn promises.

This Bill is a makeshift, is merely provisional, having as its sole justification that it is the offering of an essentially provisional government. The emergency reason falls to the ground after the statements made by the leaders of British politics. The reason of emergency put forward by this Government is a dream, which has become the laughing stock of the country, and our hon. friends realize it so well that they are striving all of them to find a word which has not yet been laughed out of court, some alleging a crisis, others a bounden duty and the hon. Postmaster General, always well inspired, has met the situation by terming it a "pressing need."

That emergency at will has been invented to provide an excuse for the Nationalists, and put them in a position to throw aside their election pledges. But that is a rather small exit, and to get through it it will be necessary for them to stoop.

Who are the promoters of this legislation? Who are its supporters? What is its object? Listen to the utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), in his speech of December 18, 1912, p. of Hansard:

My right hon. friend says further that this product is a hybrid, bred of Tory jingoism and Nationalism. They have been together, and this is the result. I am puzzled. Suppose it was, does it make much matter if the rich fruit on the tree comes from one soil or another, is tended by one gardener or another, or by two, provided that the apple itself, in its flavour and quality, is all right?

I notice a smile passing over the face of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, as he thinks of that fine apple.

Had not my right hon. friend better savour the apple instead of chemically, or otherwise, analyzing the soils out of which it has sprung? But, I am puzzled besides. He says that is the result of an unholy alliance between the Tories and the Nationalists. Well, I come back to his speech, and what does he say? Immediately this resolution was passed disension broke out in the Liberal-Conservative party; there were two sections, one section wanted a contribution only and no navy, the other section wanted neither contribution nor navy. If there was a choice at all, one section was for the Canadian service, while it utterly abhorred the contribution. Then, he said that this is the result of an unholy alliance between the Nationalists and the Liberal-Conservatives. If it is the result, who won? After which parent does the child take its traits? Here is a measure which says contribution; the Nationalist damns contribution, will have none of it. Evidently he did not get his way. How then does the right hon. gentleman argue it out that this is the