

vision for the protection of the country is a necessity of the world's conditions. It would have to be made and paid for no matter what Canada's political affiliations. It is something to be regarded as a duty, not as a matter of hurrah or political profit or partisan zeal. And there is no difference in principle between defence by sea and defence by land. If these things are forgotten in the discussions of the next few months, and any important section of the opposition sets aside its wholesome party traditions to join in what seems to be a big noise, then again will a promising chance of success be thrown away."

I will now part company with the hon. leader of the opposition. Let me come to my friend the member for Jacques Cartier. In his speech the other day, which I will not undertake to review in toto, because a large part of it is of a character which I do not feel called upon to answer, here is what my hon. friend said, speaking of the election in Drummond and Arthabaska:

"I believe that no less a sum than \$50,000 was expended by my right hon. friend's party."

This is said in a speech which is meant to be serious. When a man of the position of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier makes such a statement, he says too much or he does not say enough. It is not sufficient to say, 'I believe that the sum of \$50,000 was expended by the right hon. gentleman's party.' I might say that I believe that a sum equal to that was spent by the Nationalist party. If my hon. friend were to ask me what is my authority for the statement, I would say I have none, no more than he has. There is just as much truth in the one statement as in the other. These things, Sir, are not meant for grave discussion, and I have to ask the House's pardon for having spent a minute of its time in alluding to such an insane assertion. But I come to something more serious. In my hon. friend's speech—and this is the part I intend to review—my hon. friend made use of these words—his words:

"On the one hand we have, as I hope to be able to show presently, a misrepresentation of our attitude and our policy on the facts of the case by the Prime Minister."

A misrepresentation—this is big language. I doubt if it is parliamentary. But I did not call your attention to it, Sir, at the time, nor do I intend to call your attention to it at this moment. I noticed it at the time, but I was eager to follow my hon. friend to the end of his speech. I listened to him attentively, because this was not the first time that my hon. friend had stated that I had misrepresented facts in regard to this naval policy. In many speeches delivered in the province of Quebec I had read the same words. I was anxious to

know, and till the other day I never did understand what my hon. friend meant when he stated that I had misrepresented certain facts with regard to the naval policy, and concealed something which I should have disclosed. My hon. friend, but not so much he as the leader of the party in Quebec, made the statement more than once that there has been a conspiracy in this matter between His Excellency the Governor General and myself. Now, Sir, I am here to answer my hon. friend today. I understand now what he means; I have read his speech carefully. My hon. friend contends, when he says that we have misgilded the House and have kept something hidden, that on the 10th of February, 1909, an order in council was passed approving a plan which had previously been selected by the Canadian ministers at the conference of 1908, and which pledged Canada to participate in the military armaments of Great Britain, that that order was passed in secret, was kept concealed for a long time, and was so concealed when the naval policy of the government was brought before the House. In order to do no injustice to my hon. friend, I will quote his very words and leave the House to judge between him and me in this matter. The House can then judge for itself what value is to be attached to the words of my hon. friend. In his speech, after having reviewed the conference of 1902 and the conference of 1907 and after having given me a meed of praise for my attitude at both of those conferences, which almost brought a blush to my cheeks, saying that he approved of almost everything that I had done as representing Canada, my hon. friend went on as follows:

"I am not aware that in the elections of 1908 or at any time—I speak subject to correction—his conduct in that respect was called into question. How can we explain the attitude of my right hon. friend subsequently? Through all the negotiations from beginning to end something seems to be hidden. Let me call the attention of the House to what happened in 1909. My right hon. friend claimed that everything has been above board. But in 1909, the question never having been submitted to this House or to the people, while we were sitting here in the month of February, an order in council was passed, which will be found on Paper 99, of the Sessional Papers of 1909:

"Return to an address calling for a copy of orders in council, correspondence, letters, despatches, memoranda and communications, between the imperial and the Canadian governments relating to the organization of an imperial general staff.

"In 1909, on the 10th of February, after having had previously, at the conference of 1907, refused to accede to the proposal