

I have my instructions. Naturally I told him that I could not follow his advice, that I had come to work and intended to work. At this moment a few good Frenchmen came along and my gentleman of the police soon abandoned the idea of arresting me.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a young man, not one of those whom the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) wants to represent as old mischief makers from Ontario, who have gone to the West, but a very simple young man who has not yet seen his five and twentieth winter, his first experience perhaps in public life. He goes sincerely to speak to the people of Macdonald on behalf of wider markets, and he is followed by a policeman and threatened by that policeman with arrest and no doubt he would have been arrested only that somebody happened to be around and to divert the activity of that policeman. When it comes to this in a province of Canada, which is all united and which must be all united, in which but one citizenship can exist for the French and for the Irish, for the old and for the young, and more particularly for the young who are to be the rulers of this country after we are gone to a better or a worse world, it is time for the people of Canada and the Government of Canada to investigate such action on the part of the government of Manitoba, whether you call it the Roblin Government or by any other name; when any government abuses its authority for its own purposes, it is time that we should call a halt. We must never forget that the strength of our constitution is for the happiness of the people and that the repetition of such courses in elections, by a provincial government, whether in Richelieu or Macdonald, as have been described here to-day, gross infringements on the liberty of the citizens of Canada, cannot be permitted again under the sun of the British Empire.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it was on the 26th of February, 1910. Rigaud the small town of my county where I reside was all thrown into consternation. A storm was evidently drawing near, the elements which brought it were, in the afternoon, to reach our land, so quiet as a rule. In fact it was about three o'clock when one of the Canadian Pacific Railway trains landed a group of wild Nationalists who came there, some said, to unsettle the minds and to set their political opinion, henceforth, against the leader of the government of that day. That was the first gunshot of the campaign against the Canadian navy law. The question was to strike hard, to frighten the electors and, above all, to make an impression.

I have a sweet remembrance of the member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rain-

Mr. TURGEON.

ville) being one of the first among those who were to speak that afternoon.

How great was, on that date, my colleague of to-day! And if the same audience who then listened to him had heard him yesterday what a wretched man they would have found him to be!

He spoke with vehemence on that occasion; yesterday we could hardly hear him. He was wild. Rouget de Lisle did not reach to his heel. How faint his courage has grown since that time! Let us see what the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères said at Rigaud. I have extracts from the *Montreal Gazette*, from the *Star* and from *Le Devoir*. I shall first quote the *Montreal Gazette* of the 28th of February:

Mr. Rainville added a few observations. He pointed out Sir Wilfrid's volte-face on the Imperialism question, and denounced, as at Longueuil last Sunday, the falsity of the national character of the proposed navy.

The scheme of a naval force to be put at England's service, he said, was a violation of the Militia and Defence Act, drawn up by Sir George Etienne Cartier in 1868, in which it is expressly declared that our militia force should never have to fight outside of Canada or for other cause than the defence of Canadian soil and Canadian interests.

As to the *Montreal Star* of the same date, it published what follows:

Mr. J. H. Rainville said that the navy would belong to Canada in time of peace. In time of war it would belong to England. The question of a creation of a Canadian navy has arisen, he contended, as a consequence of the preaching of Imperialists of the Chamberlain School. These Imperialists had found that they could not tax the poor people of England any more. That source of revenue was becoming exhausted. So they were now turning their attention to the colonies. What they could not get out of the English poor, they hoped to extract from Canada, Australia and Cape Colony.

Evidence was shown of this in the war which the Northcliffe papers had made on the Lloyd-George budget during the recent election in Great Britain. Lloyd George too had recognized that the poor could not be taxed more heavily, and he had turned his attention to the wealthy.

Now, here is an extract from *Le Devoir* of the 28th of February, 1910:

I am sure, said Mr. Rainville, that there is here a great number of Liberals who admire Laurier because he knew how to 'stand up' in 1912, when Chamberlain tried to find out what the Canadians thought of Imperialism. 'What is it that may have happened since 1902, 1905 and 1907 to give rise to such a change of attitude in the Liberal party?' He foresees that Mr. Boyer will quote the Militia Act, drawn up by George Etienne Cartier and which prescribes the creation of a Canadian Militia bound to take part in the wars 'in which Canada would be interested.'