

cabinet, particularly the ministers from Quebec, and the Liberal party in general, concerning armaments. A great deal of the press of the province of Quebec is at this time making a determined effort to mislead the people of that province, and to make political capital out of the question of armaments. I am sure our ministers can well defend themselves, but to represent the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) or other ministers from the province of Quebec as imperialists or as ministers in favour of Canada's participation in European wars is to show malice aforethought and to express a base lie.

May I mention particularly *L'Illustration* as the best example of how vile, how low and how reptile-like a newspaper may be, in the paid service of unscrupulous and furious political opponents. As a new member I have observed what has been going on in the chamber and, astonishing as the fact may be, day after day I have seen that yellow paper, *L'Illustration*, on the desk and in the hands of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Sir George Perley) and have seen him and the right hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) bend their heads together over that abominable sort of paper, which I call *L'Illustration*, apparently enjoy the perusal of its articles and make feast of the outrageous and deliberate falsehoods appearing in its pages about the attitude of the ministers from Quebec. Those are falsehoods which are intended to make the people of Quebec lose confidence in the Minister of Justice, in the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), in the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Power), and in the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret).

May I praise most heartily the independent press for the good work it is doing for its readers, and the impartial newspapers for the service they render their subscribers, but let me loathe and deprecate a paper such as *L'Illustration* for the bad service it renders to the citizens of the province of Quebec.

I regret that in connection with the issue of armaments and the increase in the estimate for the Department of National Defence I have to disagree with the government, but in doing so I am getting not nearer but much farther away from the Conservative party, which in Canada is known as the imperialist party. It is quite possible that the government is right in its present defence policy and it is also possible the future will prove that the estimates for this year were not excessive. Time will tell. I foresee that the estimates for national defence will be passed by this house and I am sure they will be found to be much too small by the Conservative party, whether or not they admit it. I

[Mr. Brunelle.]

am proud to declare that the policy of the Liberal party has been proved to be good and profitable to the country in every respect. I believe in that policy, but I disagree as to the amount intended to be spent this year on armaments.

Mr. L. D. TREMBLAY (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, in rising this evening to oppose the amendment now before the house, I am conscious of fulfilling a serious and imperative duty. Since the beginning of this debate I have listened to the views which have been expressed. I have given much attention to this question of armaments. The amendment reads:

This house views with grave concern the startling increases of expenditure proposed by the government for purpose of national armament—

I ask the mover of this amendment (Mr. MacNeil) if the house should not also view with concern the conditions facing the whole world at the present time. Every nation is increasing its armaments at a terrific pace. Against whom are they arming? Is my hon. friend in a position to tell me? Does he think what is going on now in Europe is encouraging? Does he view conditions in Spain as a proof of peace? Let us not be satisfied with words. In June, 1914, who ever thought that a European war was impending? The hon. member is a fellow war veteran and I want to assure him that I am not discussing such a momentous problem from a partisan point of view. Will my hon. friend state that in the spring of 1914 there were even a dozen men in Canada who foresaw the war that came in that year? I hate war just as much as do he and my other war comrades. Like all hon. members of this house I do not want my children—I am proud to say that I have eleven—to have to go to war, and I shall not betray them and my fellow citizens and force them to undergo the terrible experiences which the men of my generation had to go through.

Surely the mover of this amendment realizes that the world hardly perceives where it is going and does not realize what may be in store for it. I am astounded at some of the statements made by hon. members. They say that Canada either will be threatened with war, or will not. If she is threatened with war, some hon. members say that either England or the United States will defend us and we need not worry. If she is not threatened with war, some hon. members say, "Why should we arm?" I wish to take up the first alternative, namely, that in case of war England or the United States would defend us. May I be permitted to quote a