

of members from both sides of the House, which, and rightly so, would have comprised a majority of Government members, a committee which would have looked into the question with a view to arriving at conclusion acceptable to both parties; in other words a procedure sanctioned by immemorial usage in British parliaments, and particularly in ours.

But precisely that is what this Government was adverse to. The reasons alleged in support of the speedy passing of this resolution have no foundation; the Government's primary object is to, in the first place, force through the \$35,000,000 contribution bill for the benefit of Great Britain, which has no need for it; and then to deprive us of all freedom of speech. The Government realizes that fight put up by the Opposition has discredited, and rightly so, that legislation in the eyes of the public; it hesitates accordingly to submit it to the people, satisfied that it will there meet with defeat. On the other hand, the Government is aware that the Opposition, thus supported by public opinion, cannot and should not concur in that proposal, and that more than ever it is its bounden duty to oppose it by all constitutional means; hence, the fury of the Government and the extreme steps taken by it in its wrath.

That resolution besides constitutes an injustice and breach of faith towards the Opposition. The latter has taken up the glove on the ground where the Government had placed it, and has made preparations for resistance under rules which it was understood would hold good to the end; and now, on a sudden, in the heat of the fray, the Government realizing that its fate is sealed, dares to alter those rules, in the hope of ensuring a victory which is becoming more doubtful as time goes on, and avoiding a defeat the certainty of which increases from day to day.

Well, that is evidence neither of bravery nor loyalty; it is a back-down, a giving up of the sponge. The Government has already given that impression to the public; it is possible that by gagging the Opposition, by using its majority to strangle it, it may succeed in getting this resolution through, and accessorially the contribution bill; but in any case it will be a paltry victory and one which cannot restore to it the confidence of the people, the people which this contribution bill has estranged from the Government and whose good will the Government is about to entirely lose, as a result of its resorting to arbitrary means.

If that resolution had come up in the opening days of a session, or even in the ordinary course of a session, but while no other important measure was in suspense, and if the Government had followed the ordinary procedure, I mean the appoint-

ing of a committee or if, in any event, it had not prevented the Opposition from expressing its views, some measure of sincerity might be credited to it.

It is in vain that the Prime Minister has striven to find a justification to this resolution in views expressed by some Liberal candidates in the course of the electoral campaign which ended on September 21, 1911. The Prime Minister should not entertain the idea that he can satisfy a single member of this House as to the existence of any similarity between the circumstances of that time and those of to-day; he should not seriously think of passing off such views as a sop to hon. gentlemen on this side for being coerced. What were the circumstances? The Liberal ministers and members were then facing their constituents, defending a trade arrangement with the United States, in respect to which the members of the then Opposition had carried on systematic obstruction from January to July, 1911; an obstruction which had induced the Liberal Government to take the question before the people. The Liberals would say: If you return our party to power, if you approve of that trade arrangement, it will be necessary to ensure its passing through the House, and if we meet with a resistance similar to that which brought on this election, it will be incumbent on us to find some way out, and possibly the only way of settling the matter will be by amending the rules of the House. Now, the Liberal party was defeated; so that from the constitutional viewpoint that arrangement has been condemned, as also the proposal to modify the rules of the House towards ensuring its adoption. How then can the Prime Minister claim he has justification of his stand in that proposed revision of the rules which was condemned by the electors on September 21, 1911? Not only is he without a mandate to submit that resolution, which itself is intended to permit the forcing through of the \$35,000,000 contribution bill, in respect to which, as well, he is without a mandate, but he is going beyond the mandate he holds in forcing through this resolution, the principle of which has been condemned by the people on September 21, 1911.

So that we are confronted with a series of hateful deeds emanating from this Government. What other result might have been expected from the present methods of this government? They started out with the contention that it was urgent to aid Great Britain and provide \$35,000,000 for her. That is false; from falsity they proceeded to arbitrary action and exasperation, when obstacles were met on the way; from exasperation they proceeded to violence, from violence to brute force, from brute force to despotism; they will

Mr. LACHANCE