

Public Works on January 20. The return called for reports, documents and correspondence between the two departments and other documents as well in connection with providing proper post office facilities for Lethbridge. The return evidently was prepared by the Public Works Department, but I think it has escaped the attention of the hon. gentleman's department as there is no correspondence with his department shown in the return, and I know there is certain correspondence that has been had with his department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into the matter and see if anything has been left out but I do not believe it has been left out. I may inform my hon. friend that his wishes in the matter have been carried out. I know he has taken some interest in the Lethbridge post office. He is probably not aware that proper post office facilities in Lethbridge have been arranged for. At all events I will see that the correspondence is completed.

Mr. MAGRATH. I thank the minister for his courtesy in giving me this information, but it has come to me already through other sources from Lethbridge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That shows that the post office is well organized.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed at the outset to express my thankfulness to my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Michaud), who was kind enough, at my request, to move last night, on my behalf, the adjournment of the debate, the state of my health preventing me from addressing the House at such a late hour. I have also to thank the House for having graciously acceded to such request, customary as it is to do so.

I had the pleasure of listening to part of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve). He is entitled to congratulations on account of the able manner in which he expounded his views, though distasteful to me. There is nothing beyond criticism in this world, and I shall single out two references in his speech to which I am bound to take exception. In the first place, he was in no way warranted in referring to the management of the Department of Marine in the manner he did. While technically a man occupying a position of trust may be called

Mr. MAGRATH.

to account before the public for certain happenings, even if he be laid up and unable to attend to business, the hon. member should in all fairness have pointed out in what respect the management was inefficient in so far as the minister was concerned; and moreover he should have supplied some proof in support of his contention, and that was lacking entirely. He was content with making a few broad statements reflecting more or less on the minister whom illness confines to his house, and in support of these he has not adduced any facts, I repeat it, although he and his friends have had a whole session and a prolonged investigation devoted to unearth such facts. In the second place, the hon. member shows some inconsistency when directly after taking exception to the government's proposal to entrust forthwith, without consulting the people, the management of the proposed navy to the Department of Marine, he turns around and approves of the proposal of the leader of the opposition to send to England forthwith and without consulting the people, two warships of the latest design, representing an expenditure of some \$25,000,000.

I am now coming to the question which has been brought up for the fourth time in this House within a year. As might be expected, the data in relation thereto have been pretty well sifted out. It has, moreover, been discussed at the last conference in London at which the Dominion government was ably represented by the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) and the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden).

The question is assumed to be entirely new. At page 3075 of the unrevised edition of Hansard, for the current session, my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) is made to say:

There can be no doubt that the policy is entirely novel, and that the people have so far been kept in the dark as to its real meaning and import.

Then at page 3078:

Will my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or any of the gentleman who sit behind him, from the province of Quebec at any rate, state that even this has been laid before the people of our province? They have never heard of it, in that shape or in any shape, and have never had any occasion to pronounce their opinion upon so important a matter.

Nevertheless, the memorandum of 1902, quoted on a previous occasion by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), is quite clear. Again, in the course of the debate which took place on March 13, 1903, previous to the two last general elections, and which was as usual widely distributed and discussed, I find that the following clean cut statements were made. At page 37 of