

House and what will they say in regard to this Bill? I have heard their expressions in regard to it.

Mr. TALBOT. Name them?

Mr. ROCHE. Their name is legion. Some hon. gentlemen came down here and were going to open up the whole question. Oh, if they could only speak their minds, would they not show up the whole thing! It is true they have a certain cohesion and adhesion. You talk of cement having cohesive and adhesive qualities—it is not in it with the spoils of office. There is a post office here, a customs house there, an armoury in another place, a drill hall some where else. A prospective cabinet ministership in some other place—and I hope the hon. member for Pictou has earned his reward by his defence this afternoon. The hon. member places men of straw to show the members with what facility he can knock them down. I have referred to his misrepresentation. He stated that the hon. member for North Toronto misquoted a speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1888. I challenge him to show a word of misquotation. I say he made no reference to that speech except four or five lines.

Mr. MACDONALD. I said he had quoted a part of the speech of the Prime Minister and did not quoted the context to show what he did mean.

Mr. ROCHE. The portion of the speech to which he took exception was in a speech delivered in this House in 1892 by the Prime Minister and if he looks up 'Hansard' he will find that.

Mr. MACDONALD. If you look it up you will find it was given as 1888. I went to 'Hansard' and found it.

Mr. ROCHE. He referred to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and said to him: What has the French language to do with the Bill before the House? I would ask that hon. member to discuss this question on broad national lines. What has his reference to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as being a former temperance lecturer got to do with it? I would say to him: Let him first take the beam out of his own eye before he attempts to pluck the mote out of his brother's. He has referred to the leader of the opposition as being in favour of giving 'tribute.' The hon. gentleman is a lawyer; he knows the meaning of the word 'tribute.' Are we proposing to give tribute to the motherland, when we, voluntarily, of our own free will, and in a time of emergency, grant a contribution of money to strengthen the British navy? Do you call that 'tribute'? The hon. gentleman had better re-read his history if he desires to find the true meaning

of the word. I have heard arguments put forward by hon. members surrounding the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and these hon. gentlemen have not taken the position that a voluntary grant was anything in the nature of tribute. The hon. gentleman (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has gone so far as to say that the leader of the opposition has had a letter addressed to him by the old leader of the Liberal-Conservative party to task for not supporting that measure of the government, and urging him to support it. That letter was written—and the hon. gentleman knows it—before the proposition of the government was submitted to this House at all. If Sir Charles Tupper had written this letter after seeing the provisions of the Bill now before the House, and had taken the Conservative party to task for not supporting that measure, there might be some force in the hon. gentleman's criticism. That letter, written by the former leader of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, was against annual, stated, fixed contributions. So, the hon. member for Pictou, in offering his criticisms on that letter, as well as on the policy of the leader of the opposition in regard to these criticisms, does not differentiate between an emergency contribution and a contribution made annually, a fixed, stated sum, to be continued as a permanency. He was not fair in his representation in that regard.

Now, the hon. member states that the Australian unit and the New Zealand unit are meant for the protection of the coasts of those countries, and he says that that is what we are doing here. And in what manner? By providing, for instance, two 'Bristols' on the Pacific ocean to 'protect' our own shores—two vessels that, according to the leading Liberal journal of the province of Quebec are purposely built to elude the pursuit of the enemy. The hon. member for Pictou has also put words into the mouth of the leader of the opposition when he states that that hon. gentleman does not want docks built in Canada, does not want a naval college, does not want ships constructed in Canada, and so on. I would ask him to point to a single expression of the leader of the opposition to bear out his assertions.

An hon. MEMBER. He can't do it.

Mr. ROCHE. He cannot do it without misrepresenting the facts. And, is it not amusing to hear the hon. member for Pictou give voice to good Conservative doctrine, of giving work to our own home people, of maintaining our own workshops, of keeping our money in our own country—a good protectionist speech; whereas, in the days gone by, these hon. gentlemen, when in opposition, had only one cry and shibboleth, and that was to buy in the cheapest market? Now, the Prime Minister (Sir Wil-