

port; and, because he would not sign away his independence, he was driven from the ranks of hon. members opposite.

Mr. E. ROY. Will the hon. member (Mr. Roche) allow me a question? Does not he know that Mr. Lavergne chose not to run in the last Dominion election, but sought a seat in the local house?

Mr. ROCHE. I did not say it was in the last election. Mr. Lavergne himself is the authority for what I have just said. He used these expressions in this House and before his colleagues, and none of them denied the truth of what he said.

Mr. E. ROY. It was before he left the federal political arena.

Mr. ROCHE. Certainly, and how is he being treated by his friends? Are they giving him the glad hand? Is it not rather a back-handed way of treating an old political friend? But he is not the only one. There is Mr. Richardson, of Winnipeg, who was elected a member of this House in 1896, and who refused to support this government because they had gone back on their pledges to the people; he also has been driven into outer darkness, and is no more recognized amongst them. Then there was the late Mr. Tarte, a gentleman who, for speaking his own opinions, and holding his own convictions, for preaching what other gentlemen in the cabinet had been practising, was read out of the party; and others who had dared to assert their independence have been treated in the same way, as the serpent was hung up in the wilderness, as a warning to others who dare assert their independence in opposing this Bill. They know the punishment that will be meted out to them. Therefore, I say that the spoils of office have stronger cementing qualities than anything else. I do not think it lies in the mouth of those hon. gentlemen to reproach the members of this side of the House for having the manliness to give a free and untrammelled expression to their opinions, because our leader does not put into operation any gag law on this side of the House, there is room for a diversity of opinion on a great public question like this. But is there that harmony of views amongst our friends opposite that they wish us to believe exists? I think not. We have all read the published interview of Senator Domville, a Liberal, who has condemned in unmeasured terms the government proposition for the construction of a Canadian navy. Of course it may be said that he is beyond the reach of the hand of the Prime Minister. It does happen occasionally that when men get beyond this Chamber they assert their independence. Then we have read the published interview of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who, if he has

Mr. ROCHE.

been correctly reported, and I presume he has been, has made declarations which show that he cannot be claimed as an enthusiastic supporter of the government's navy proposals. Why, Sir, read the speeches delivered in this House last session on the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto; especially read the speeches of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Warburton), of the member for Dorchester (Mr. Roy), of the member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), and you will look in vain for that harmony of views which hon. gentlemen say prevails in their ranks. Some of the statements of these gentlemen have been referred to by my hon. friend from North Toronto. The member for the Yukon certainly made no pro-British speech in this House; we on this side thought he made an anti-British speech, he opposed a contribution towards the Canadian navy. These gentlemen little thought at that time that they would be called upon to support a Bill of this nature. The hon. member for the Yukon, speaking here last year, opposed any contribution. He said, even if the fleet of England were destroyed, Canada would not be in the slightest danger of any foreign aggression. Well, I refer him to the speech of the Prime Minister, his own leader, who stated, on the second reading of the Bill that our whole national existence depends on the supremacy of the British navy. Let these gentlemen get together and harmonize their views that are now so divergent. And still they reproach members on this side of the House with holding divergent views. And yet the hon. gentleman stated in the same breath that Germany's fleet was the outcome simply of her desire to found colonies for her surplus population. Where is she going to get those colonies? According to the authority I have quoted, she must found them on British territory, and this desire must inevitably lead to a clash between Germany and England. The hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., I believe, has occupied an honourable position in his own province, and I am sorry he has not taken a broader minded view of this question. He was not in sympathy with the resolution, and he instanced what we were doing in the way of national defence. He took the ground that when we were developing our own resources we were doing all that we should be called upon to do for imperial defence. He says:

We are providing homes for the people of England, and relieving the congestion in that country.

Fancy, Doukhobors, Galicians and Poles come into Canada, and are treated in all respects on the same terms as the Englishman, and we are relieving the congestion