

tain course, no matter how clearly circumstances might make it his duty to adopt that course, he would be gravely to be condemned for making such a promise. And, when circumstances which he did not control made it his imperative duty, in the interests of his country, or brought home to his mind the conviction that it was his imperative duty in the interests of his country, to take the course that he had promised not to take, would hon. gentlemen contend that he should say, "Yes, it is quite clear now, the salvation of my country depends upon a certain course being taken, I am the man who is in a position to take it, I alone, can set on foot the measures to bring it about, but I made a promise, and I must stand by it, and see the honour of my country lost, and see the soldiers of my country left unsupported, and see possible defeat come to those to whom I have pledged my assistance, and see the cause that I thought of such importance as to justify my plunging my country into war go down to disgraceful defeat, because, forsooth, I rashly and unwisely made a promise?" I say, Mr. Speaker, that a man who, in those circumstances, would feel that he was withheld from doing that which was his clear duty, gravely as he had offended in making the rash promise, would offend more gravely by keeping it. I see my hon. friend from Montcalm smiling at me in a calm way. I put a case before him. I have heard people speak in the strongest way against the use of firearms. I have heard men say that never, under any circumstances, or under any conditions, was a man justified in carrying a firearm, or in using it against his neighbour. Suppose a man, having made that declaration and pledge, finds himself in a situation where his house has been broken into by a powerful ruffian, who, perhaps, proceeded to outrage his wife and his daughter; the firearm lies right by his hand. Would the member for Montcalm say that the husband should fold his arms with the remark: oh, I made a promise; I shall not interfere?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I never said that.

Mr. DOHERTY: The member for Montcalm—and the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) also, if I may judge from what he said the other evening, with his hands in the air, about the "broken faith" of this Government—would stand behind that husband and say: beware, your broken faith, your broken faith! And he would expect that husband to drop his firearm and take no action. After the ruffian had

carried out his operations to his own satisfaction, and this promiser, his house looted and his family murdered, was himself ready for the grave, I suppose the member for Rouville would conduct the victim there in admiration and would see to it that a monument was erected to his memory. I suppose he would inscribe upon that monument the words of the poet about a man who acted not dissimilarly: "Faith, unfaithful, made him falsely true."

I say again that I never made any promise. If it is said that I made such a promise, I am not questioning the statement of the gentleman who so understood my remarks. If I had made any such promise, I would have done a thing that I should not have done. If the circumstances be such as the Prime Minister says they are to-day on the other side of the water, and as I absolutely believe them to be; and if the reasons which I gave this afternoon prove that the only effective way of meeting these conditions is the adoption of this measure, then I say that had I made such a promise, my only course as a man of honour would have been to do that which my position here, the exigencies of the case and the needs of my country called upon me to do.

So much for pledges and promises. The member for Montcalm to-day gave great credit to the ex-Secretary of State (Hon. E. I. Patenaude) for his action in leaving this Government. To what did the member for Montcalm attribute that action? He said that the former Secretary of State would rather leave this Government than be a party to the breaking of these pledges, and he expressed the wish that other gentlemen had felt likewise. I should like the member for Montcalm to remember the expression by which he qualified the statement that he attributed to me. As I do not like to get beyond Parliamentary rules, all I ask him to do is to take it that I am making a similar statement with regard to the statement of his; that the ex-Secretary of State left this Government rather than break his pledges. Did the member for Montcalm read the letter of the ex-Secretary of State? Does he still persist in saying that the reason he gave why the ex-Secretary of State left the Government is correct? I will not try to qualify his action if he does so; the member for Montcalm would have just the word to use—but I shall not use it.