

in the campaign of Drummond and Arthabaska. And why was he interrupted? Because his position then was in direct conflict with that which he had previously occupied, and it was a surprise to those with whom he had been associated not long before, and displeased them; and now it seems to me he should take the consequences of the dual position he deemed it advisable to occupy at those two different periods, and not charge it upon the Liberal or any other party.

I need not refer to the position that the honourable Postmaster General took on the Naval policy in the election of Drummond and Arthabaska. It was a matter of debate in the House of Commons, and if honourable members desire to refer to the admissions then made by the honourable member I would refer them to the Commons Debates for 1910, pages 145 and 146. I will not take the time of the House to read those debates, but the honourable gentleman then admitted the whole thing. I will cite just a small portion. The Hon. Mr. Brodeur, now a judge of the Supreme Court, was speaking. He said:

Another gentleman who spoke at those meetings was the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin). I may say that most of these extracts are taken from *Le Devoir*, their organ, and I have every reason to believe that they are correct. Here is what the hon. gentleman said on the 25th of October, at St. Louis de Blandford:

"You are intimidating the people in waving the English flag, and adding that we must contribute always and everywhere to the defence of that protector of our constitutional liberties; but we will not be made to forget that in 1837 it was necessary to bore holes in it in order to breathe the atmosphere of liberty."

Mr. Blondin: I deny most of these statements in *Le Devoir*. I did not till to-day have any knowledge of that report, and I can explain it.

Mr. Brodeur: It is an unreliable paper by what the hon. gentleman says, then why is he having *Le Devoir* distributed in his county. I am surprised at that.

Mr. Blondin: I see by the speech of the right hon. the Premier that not only may *Le Devoir* be at fault sometimes, but even himself.

Mr. Brodeur: The same hon. member, speaking at St. Louis de Blandford said:

"The English have never done anything for the French Canadians. We do not owe them anything. French Canadians have nothing to care about the opinion of the other provinces upon this naval question. They can and must settle the questions which concern them without consulting others. Those very ones who disembowelled their forefathers on the Plains of Abraham ask of you to-day to be slaughtered for their sake."

Is that false, too?

Mr. Blondin: Yes. The speech which I was answering is not reported there. If it were, you would understand it better.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUÉ.

Mr. Brodeur: Well, we will take another one, of the 30th of October:

"England has gone so far as to grind down the colonies as did imperial Rome of old."

Mr. Blondin: Absolutely false.

Mr. Brodeur (reading):

"The only liberties which we enjoy have been snatched. England has not conquered Canada for love or to plant the cross of Christ as did France, but to establish trading posts and make money. She has sowed the world with hatred, quarrels and wars. We have had enough of England and the English."

Mr. Blondin: I did not say the first phrase, and I think Mr. Beland will deny it also.

Then Mr. Béland says:

Mr. Béland: I may say that I was present at that meeting, and I remember exactly the words pronounced by the hon. member for Champlain, and as far as I can remember, that is an exact reproduction of his speech.

Mr. Blondin: I do not deny that that was said, but it was not said by me.

Mr. Brodeur: Well, it is very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. After all, the Prime Minister was perfectly justified yesterday in saying that a victory won by such means was disastrous—disastrous to the Conservative party, and to-day they are ashamed of the work they have done.

Mr. Blondin: I am not ashamed. I will repeat them to you to-morrow.

Now, I say the honourable gentleman made admissions then which he repeated the other day in this House, and he should bear with good grace the consequences of his conduct at that time. I see no reason why it should be made the occasion of his abusing the honourable member for De Lorimier as he did the other day.

The honourable gentleman invited us to compare the position which he occupies with that of the honourable member from De Lorimier. He claimed to be more representative of the people than the honourable member for De Lorimier. As far as that gentleman is concerned, he occupies such a position, not only in this country but elsewhere, myself and other honourable gentlemen in this House would be proud to occupy. The honourable Postmaster General should not lose sight of the fact that he ran in an election as a minister and was defeated; and it was after he was defeated that he was entrusted as a member of this House with a department. The honourable member should bear in mind that there was no precedent either in England or in this country of a minister rejected by the people being brought into the House of Lords in England or the Senate in Canada and entrusted with a portfolio and the administration of a public department. Therefore I think the honourable gentleman should be more discreet in comparing his position with that of other honourable members of this House.