

What spectacle do we see now? In Germany, we see the Krupp Company, the most important of that country for the construction of implements of war, accused of conspiracy with other countries of Europe, the better to increase the armaments which are now denounced by the whole world. And that, with the sole object of increasing their capital and to swell their revenues at the expense of the people.

I say that the Government, in passing that measure of thirty-five millions, helps in keeping afloat that conspiracy of the trust against the public interest, against England itself and especially against the colonies.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Hughes) referred to the promise of the Prime Minister made at a banquet which took place in Montreal on the 21st of September, 1912. The hon. Prime Minister then said that his intention was to convoke Parliament immediately, and that he would submit a measure which would be satisfactory to the people and to England, and that if Parliament should see fit to reject it he would appeal to the people. The hon. Prime Minister was then sincere; there was no after-thought in what he said. But, since then, the situation has been greatly altered. New elements have entered into the Cabinet, others have been removed, and since then the hon. Prime Minister has turned right about face, as moreover he has done with reference to many other questions. Why does he no longer desire to appeal to the people? Is he afraid of the people? Has he become frightened? There is no other conclusion but he is prevented from keeping his promise by the dread of the popular verdict. Does he fear to be reproached with the scandals of Hochelaga, of Macdonald and Antigonish? Does he fear that some one will upbraid him with the scandal of the mail-bag locks of the Postmaster General? Does he fear to be reminded of the scandal of the Vancouver lands, or again of those lands in the West sold for \$10 to a political favourite and which have been valued at \$374,000? Does he fear to be reproached with the release of a man convicted to jail for forgery, to put him in the Civil Service, as he has done in Nova Scotia? Does he fear to be refused the free disposition of those thirty-five millions?

He is afraid of everything. He is even afraid, to-day, of the visit of the hon. leader of the Opposition to Toronto. We now see that those hon. gentlemen are convoking a meeting in Toronto, in the midst of the session, for the 19th of May next, at the very moment when the Prime Minister seems to be in such a hurry to get through with the work of the session that he now asks the House to sit in the morning, in the afternoon, and in the evening.

Mr. ETHIER

What better proof could we have that those gentlemen are now panic-struck and that they wish, in having the Prime Minister go to Toronto, try to destroy the prestige of the eloquent speech of the leader of the Opposition. The prestige of the hon. leader of the Opposition is so great that, besides him, that of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Public Works go constantly decreasing, with the exception of the prestige of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) which is always getting more and more magnified.

Mr. GAUVREAU: They are frightened out of their wits, and they will now get the harm.

Mr. ETHIER: And that harm will be incurable. Why does not the Government accede to the wishes of the people? Why does he not accede to the desire of the majority of the people; a minority in this House, it is true, but a majority in the country, whatever may be said to the contrary, and that fact has been established with eloquence and certitude, last week, by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin), when he then gave figures that nobody has been so daring as to contradict.

Why not accede to the wishes of the people? Is it for fear that Mr. Monk should wake up? Is there any fear that he will come back from the south of the United States to give another conference at Côte St. Paul, when, as every one knows, there is nothing he fears so much as being compelled to set foot in this House?

Why did not the ex-Minister of Public Works come in this House, in order to give the explanations which every minister is obliged to give in similar circumstances? Has he been prevented from coming? Has he been beseeched not to come? We do not know. However, it is a well-known fact that he differs in opinion from the Government with respect to that contribution of thirty-five millions. Mr. Monk was asking for a referendum before giving that contribution, and when he met with a refusal he resigned his portfolio.

He has shown some courage which did not last long, and which was followed with a show of cowardice. He has had a moment of courage which the other French ministers have not had; but that did not last long.

The benefit which has accrued to him by that act of courage in the esteem of the people and in my own—if that may count for anything—has been lost when he saw fit to become the instrument and the creature of the Government, in being frightened away from the floor of this House to explain his conduct.

But that is not all. A few days ago, at Côte St. Paul, while discussing the question of closure, he expressed himself as