

eloquent speeches in an attack on that war and time has shown that he was right. It has been established that the Crimean War was without result and had no cause. So I claimed for the Parliament of Canada the same right that John Bright claimed in the Imperial Parliament. And I should add that by doing so I scandalized both the Imperialists and the Nationalists.

Liberty of Decision.

"Neither of them challenged the position. No one denied that the Canadian Parliament had the right of pronouncement on the question of participation or non-participation. But the Imperialist wanted Parliament to close its eyes and to fight in any war. The Nationalist wanted Parliament to close its eyes and to fight in no wars. We Liberals asked for nothing more than the liberty which had been guaranteed to us.

"If I state our position now, it is not because I wish to raise a discussion on these questions. So long as the War continues, so long as the soil of Belgium is occupied, so long as the last German has not been kicked out of France, so long is this not the time to discuss these questions. All our attention should be directed to the prosecution of the War and to the bringing about of that final victory which we hope to secure. But when the War is over, we shall have to take up these questions again. And the people of Canada will be called upon to decide between the opposing parties. If I mention the questions now, it is merely because I wish to indicate the motives of our actions.

Navy Promises Not Kept.

"You have heard in Montreal a singular reasoning. Or perhaps it would be better to call it a statement rather than a reasoning. It has been asked, why should the Liberals not do as Conservatives have done. In 1910 and 1911, the Conservative party was composed of all shades. You hear it said that the Conservatives then condemned the Navy Act and you are asked why Liberals should not fight the Government in the same way now.

The Conservatives condemned the Navy Act and made promises. But those promises they did not keep. Why, it is asked, should Liberals not do the same? Why?—Because I am leader of the Liberal party and because so long as I have the honor to preside over the destinies of the Liberal party, the Liberal party will never triumph by such methods. If there is one spectacle more demoralizing than another, it is to see a party making promises to the electorate, and then disavowing those promises once it is elected to office. Never will the Liberal party triumph by such methods and when I remember that it was in Montreal that I last defended the Navy Act—when I remember that in spite of Conservative promises that Act is still in force and is being administered by those who denounced it—if I had desire for vengeance, I might say that I am avenged.—(Cheers)

War for Justice.

"England to-day," Sir Wilfrid continued, "is

fighting in Europe for the triumph of justice of liberty. England might have avoided the fight had she been willing to consent to the infamous bargain proposed by Germany. England is fighting to-day for the independence of Belgium, for the integrity of the people of France and to save civilization. That is why I declared that I should support the policy of the Government.

"On this point, I find my ideas reproduced, or rather the same ideas expressed in a letter written to the Minister of Militia by Oliver Asselin (one of the founders of the Quebec Nationalist party). Mr. Asselin is not one of my personal friends. Nor is he one of my political enemies. But I welcome the sentiment expressed by Mr. Asselin in his letter to the Minister of Militia accepting an invitation to help in the raising of a battalion. Mr. Asselin says: 'Without abandoning my well-known political principles, I think I am serving the cause of humanity in helping the Allies. I think it the individual duty of every man to contribute to that end.' Mr. Asselin says that to fight for the Allies is to fight for civilization. Mr. Asselin declares that he does not depart from his political ideas. I know what those ideas are. I have learned them to my cost—(laughter)—but when Mr. Asselin writes as he has written in that letter, I welcome his words."

Mere Duty is not Enough.

"People in Montreal have said that Canada should not take part in this War, and should only defend its own soil. But there is no merit in that. Any man who would not defend his own soil would be worthy of the indignation of everyone. That is the most elemental of duties. For a noble cause, we must do more than our duty. (Cheers.)

"I have heard it said that it is a crime for our Canadians to offer our arms to battle in Europe. When the Turks besieged Vienna a long time ago, did the the King of Poland hesitate? No, he came with his armies, and in the great battle drove back the Turks, saved the city, and Christianity.

"If Germany is victorious in this War, all Europe will be at her feet. If we need another example, let us look at the example of Lafayette, who left France to help America. If we need another example, we can look at the United States who went to Cuba to save the people there from Spanish tyranny.

What is Canada's Part?

"I hear another objection—what would it serve Canada to send a few thousand men to the front? What can they do, those 150,000 or 200,000 men that Canada can send amidst the millions of men of all nations now in the struggle on the soil of old Europe? It is held that the result would be small, it would be useless, while the sacrifice is enormous. I am not ready to admit that all we can do will be useless, without result on the final victory. But how is it that we in Canada hear such language? Is it necessary to say that we carry in our hearts remembrances of Desormaux. He could only die—but he saved the colony.

"We have the testimony of Sir John French that the Canadian troops have lost nothing of the bravery of their ancestors, that they know how to