

Amendments to that text have often been proposed, but George Etienne Cartier, Charles Tupper, John A. Macdonald and Mr. Laurier have always opposed them strongly. But there is an eel—some say a snake—in the grass (laughter). Chamberlain and his disciples, who have the most authority on the press, are making, in favour of Imperialism, a campaign which is well organized. 'As it has become impossible to make the English people sweat more money by means of taxes, they wish to tax Cape Colony, India, Australia and Canada, and if we protest against that, *La Presse* and *La Patrie* say that we are uttering the race cry.'

He concluded by a fine burst of eloquence: 'Our only country is Canada, and we must fight but for its progress and prosperity.'

That is what the press has reported of the speech delivered by the honourable member. But he said something else, and our English speaking compatriots who cheered him yesterday would surely have found no attraction in the remarks he made on their account and with respect to Great Britain. Two years have elapsed since that meeting took place, and to-day I am in a position to tell the honourable member for Chambly-Verchères that the vulgar abuse with which he loaded Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion is now falling upon himself and crushing him forever. It is not the leader of the Liberal party who has been unable to keep standing on his feet, but it is his own legs which have given way until he sank to the most degrading abasement.

The honourable member for Chambly-Verchères has been able, within three or four years, to deny his party, to adopt another party, to deny this latter also, to preach a doctrine and to deny it, the whole with an impudence which sickens the honest people, as *Le Devoir* would say.

Now, let us see what his new profession of faith is. Let us see what he said yesterday in this House:

In fine, Sir, one of the great questions which interest our country to-day is that of a contribution to the Empire which Canada is part of.

The ideas are different as to the way of making this contribution, but from one end of the country to the other, the same feeling exists in favour of the necessity of maintaining England's maritime supremacy, in the interest of the whole Empire.

And note that the existence of this feeling has just come to his knowledge! Is this what he said at Rigaud? Is this what he said to the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska?

And he goes on:

And to those who would doubt it. I could quote the resolution of 1909. I could even quote, should it be necessary to go further, an article written by the editor of the newspaper *Le Devoir*, on the 12th of October,

1912, in which we read: Never have the Nationalists claimed that Canada should do nothing for the security of the Empire.

I read somewhere that the Nationalists had expressed their views concerning the defence of the country through the voice of one of their leaders, Mr. Laverne, who stated that he was in favour of the reconstruction of fortifications and of the establishment of defence works on land, &c.

Here is a further extract from the speech of my hon. colleague:

However, Sir, let me state very plainly my mind in this connection. Europe is threatened with a general war. It is not yet known whether the great powers will allow the small Balkan states to extend their boundaries. The decisive victory won by the Bulgarian army has unexpectedly set diplomacy on the alert. Inevitably the powers will have to foresee, and it is a difficult matter to intervene and it is a difficult matter to foresee what will be the outcome as regards European intercourse.

England is not a disinterested onlooker; she will likely have to take a stand, and if war breaks out, an array of all her forces will be in order. Under the circumstances, the stand taken by the Government will be readily understood.

The hon. member was opposed to the building of a navy because, he stated, in time of war it would be under the control of the British authorities. Now here is a question which crops up in which our country has no interest whatever, and the hon. member contends it is urgent for us to give out millions. He winds up with the following statement:

If we are rightly informed the Government propose introducing this year a provisional measure of assistance, reserving the right to consult the people when the time comes to provide for a permanent contribution, and such contribution, if and when it is granted, to be made dependent on the right of representation in the councils of the Empire. That is the purport of the statements made in England and in this House on behalf of the Government by the right hon. Prime Minister who has the support of the country.

They will consult the people when there is no longer any occasion for doing so, that is after the Government will have attained their purpose; and then if the people continue to grumble they will, I presume, grant them a plebiscite, to soothe their feelings. Such is the wonderful disclosure or rather justification which the hon. member had in store for us. Is it not laughable to hear him state that the reason which prompted his change of front was accidentally suggested to him by the Balkan war? Indeed, had it not been for the gallantry of those small nations who are fighting for the maintenance of their liberty and their rights, the member for Chambly and Verchères would have without compunction let Great Britain fight her own battles alone. But, on a