

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I may tell the honourable gentleman that my memory is very clear; because if the Honourable Jean Provost had assailed my character in any manner or form, I would have taken an action against him.

Mr. Bourassa, in his paper and in a book which he published, admitted that the Nationalist movement in 1911 had been subsidized and carried on by Conservative money; and I was amused to find in the Montreal Gazette of the 7th of February instant a statement by Mr. Armand Lavergne to the same effect. In Kingston, touching on Canada's naval policy and on the question as to whether this country should have a navy to be used in foreign waters, Mr. Lavergne recalled that in the general election of 1911 the Nationalists were allied with the Tories, and he added that the alliance was financed from the loyal city of Toronto.

I have said that the election of 1917 was carried by fraud. I think I have established that the election of 1911 was carried by deception at least, to use a very mild expression. These are the sources from which spring the mandate of this Government. Luckily all the people cannot be fooled all the time. Fifteen years of Liberal rule had made for a happy and prosperous people with an overflowing treasury. The Canadian family enjoyed peace within and peace without. We had extended the hand of friendship and of neighbourly fellowship to our American cousins. Tory rule has disrupted the Canadian family, each group mistrusting the other and clamouring for its rights and for justice. Tory rule has estranged us from our neighbours to the south and we are threatened with a fiscal war and reprisals. Is it any wonder that the people of Canada are restless? They have wiped out every provincial Conservative government in the land. They are ready and anxious to sit in judgment upon this Federal Tory Government, which is ashamed to fly its real colors and to show itself under its real name.

Hon. GEORGE W. FOWLER: Honourable gentlemen, I am glad, like those who have preceded me, to pay a tribute to the excellent speeches made by the mover and the seconder of the Address. They showed an intimate knowledge of the political and general affairs of this country, and their speeches were delivered in a most acceptable manner. We had a very calm, dispas-

sionate presentation of the case from his standpoint on the part of the honourable leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Bostock). His speeches are always calm and dispassionate, without rancour, and, although from a wrong standpoint, well presented. We had also a characteristic speech from the leader of the Government—a speech that must, from its form, for what it contained, and from the manner in which it was delivered, have carried conviction into the somewhat stony and obdurate hearts of honourable gentlemen opposite.

I cannot entirely agree with the statements that have been made by honourable gentlemen who have preceded me as to this Chamber. I think it very unfortunate that this Chamber has been made so small. It is narrower than the old Chamber by about five feet, I understand. It does not afford proper accommodation for the general public. This is the only part of the Parliament Buildings which is devoted to the general public on gala days. The galleries that are here, fore and aft, are a disgrace to a Chamber of this character.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: They would not be suitable in an ordinary country theatre. I would be almost afraid, at my age, to risk my life in climbing to those steep seats that are up there: I might have a fall and break my neck. There was no reason in the world why this Chamber should not have been extended twenty feet to the left. There is a series of dark rooms there that might very well have been omitted, and the Chamber might have been extended so as to make it spacious and fitting for this great country. We are supposed to be building here for one hundred years to come, and we have criticized the men who in 1860, I think, purchased the site for these buildings. We have said they were men without vision or they would have made the site larger—they would have extended it at least to Queen street, so as to have spacious grounds and a great avenue leading from the centre out through the city. After sixty years, with all the growth and development that this great country of ours has had in that time, and with the tremendous development which those of us who have faith in Canada believe will come in the future, it seems to me that there was a great lack of vision on the part of the men who designed this building, that they should have perpetrated this—shall I say