

And still further, page 4696:

The men to whom is entrusted the leadership in both political parties share other views in economic matters, but I hope that they will acknowledge the necessity of consulting the people before embarking the country in a new policy the consequences of which affect our autonomy.

I am asked in the name of the laws of evolution, to subscribe to the programme of participation in the wars of the Empire. We have made satisfactory progress by remaining true to our traditions, and we may grow and prosper, without embodying in our statute-book the baneful section which violates our most sacred rights.

I bow to the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, as to one of the conspicuous figures in Canadian history. Rising above mere party considerations, he personifies the aspirations of the native land.

And farther on, in the same speech, page 4707:

Great-Britain had adopted in regard to Canada a policy that was wise and in harmony with our aspirations. If the colonies are to take a hand in the wars of the Empire, there may result some friction which may bring about the disruption of the colonial system. The enormous sums which will be sent towards helping Great Britain will be a heavy burden on the shoulders of the Canadian people.

The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin), Deputy Speaker of this House, was not less energetic in his statements. I shall quote some of his statements from page 4453 of 'Hansard' for 1909-1910:

Much as I regret it, I feel that I am bound to protest loudly both against the policy of the Government and against that of my own party as regards the question of creating a Canadian-Imperial war fleet or of making a cash contribution.

In rising to concur in the amendment moved by the hon. member from Jacques-Cartier asking that the question be submitted to the people before the Government settle this matter, I am fully confident that I am merely ruled by my regard for the people and the institutions of this country, as the hon. member himself was.

I now come to the statements made by the hon. member for Terrebonne, Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), to be found at page 4537 of 'Hansard' for 1909-10:

I shall vote against the Bill because it involves the recognition of military Imperialism, because it aims at having that principle recorded in our statute books. I shall vote against the amendment because it involves the same principle and because I do not admit that there is any emergency under the present circumstances.

And again at page 4538:

So long as the colonies have no voice in the chapter, and until they have their word to say in the councils of the Empire, which de-

cides for war or peace no system devised to make the colonies participate in the general defence will have any chance to live or to last.

For my part, I have very little confidence in this kind of vague, optional, and indefinite support which certain colonies are now giving to the Imperial defence, any old way. . .

How well we recognize here the characteristic style of the Minister of Inland Revenue!

. . . and in proportions more or less generous and accentuated, with ostentation in certain cases on the part of some colonies, as if they sought to humiliate others. To my mind nothing durable will come out of it, unless it be friction, rivalry, hatred, dislocation and the rupture of the bonds which unite the colonies to the Empire.

We are not a nation; we are simply a self-governing colony, making our evolution within the bonds which unite us to England, with a proconsul as a link between the two. It is all very well to tell a different story in election time, to enthrone the people after the banquet. . .

The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was not seen at banquets then.

Amid the fumes of wine which lead to boasting, to over confidence and self complacency.

And further on, always in the same speech, page 4544:

Great Britain lost her finest colonies in 1776 because she sought to impose upon them, 'taxation without representation.'

What difference is there between the taxation of the colonies for the benefit of the Empire. . . the direct method of taxation, and that which consists in obliging them to tax themselves for the maintenance of armaments to be used in defence of the Empire and for wars of the Empire? Is it not the same thing under a less forbidding aspect, but just as compulsory, ruinous, hideous?

Such practice is inconsistent with the principle of self-government and it does not matter much whether it is direct cash payments which are thus obtained, or the building and maintenance of warships.

And finally, at page 4548:

But I say without the least hesitation that the most dangerous of all Imperialists are the disguised Imperialists, because people are not on their guard, because they do not show their hand, because they instil their doctrine drop by drop, as a deadly poison.

Mr. SEVIGNY: (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: (Translation.) If the hon. member will promise to break the silence which he has kept ever since the beginning of this debate, I shall allow him to ask a question; if not, I object.

The other wing of the Conservative party opposed the Laurier Bill for entirely different reasons. Its leader, who is to-day the