

The success of the Allies was then far from his thoughts. He paralyzed for more than six months all enrollment for the front and our troops in the field received fewer reinforcements during the twelve months which followed the introduction of conscription than they had under the voluntary system. But he won the election, which was the one object of this bit of political strategy. In the same way, in 1911, in order to gain the election, he paralyzed the construction of a Canadian navy, which would have protected our coasts in the day of peril.

It is untrue, therefore, to say that, if the province of Quebec is isolated, that is not the fault of Sir Robert Borden. There is not a single French Canadian possessing the least regard for his own dignity and for his duty towards his race who would consent to serve under a man who had treated his people so shamefully. Temporary isolation is better than servitude. To enter this cabinet would be not only to commit an act of servility, to play the role of a whipped cur, but it would be also to be come an accomplice in the robbery, in broad daylight, of the last elections, which imposed upon us what is nothing but a *de facto* Government. To this Government, born of force and trickery, the product of an iniquitous election law, the province of Quebec owes nothing but the expression of her contempt.

RAOUL DANDURAND,

Senator.

I have said that we are to-day facing a sham Union Government. When the idea of a Union Government was first mooted by Sir Robert Borden, he went to a number of the leaders of the Liberal party and offered them an opportunity to join in the administration of the affairs of the country and to form a Union Government. What was the answer which he received from these gentlemen? It will be remembered that they came to Ottawa to confer upon the question. The answer was a most humiliating one to Sir Robert Borden. They said unanimously, "We will not serve under you, Sir." Some few days after the Session the Montreal Star published a telegram from Ottawa, stating that the gentlemen who had looked with contempt upon the offer of Sir Robert Borden would yield, and that the reason for their yielding was that the War Time Elections Act would force them to come to their knees, because in it Sir Robert Borden had a strangle-hold upon them. Two gentlemen, Messrs. Carvell and Maclean, had qualified the War-time Elections Act as a most horrible, iniquitous piece of legislation. Those words are to be found as having been uttered by these gentlemen from their seats in the House of Commons in the last days of the session of 1917. There are people who would have struggled, even to suffocation with that strangle-hold, rather than go down on their knees; but some of these gentlemen were not built that way—they swallowed the

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

infamy with the portfolio. I am proud to say that the Liberals of Quebec were not in that class.

The leader of the Government yesterday boasted of the achievements of the Government during the last three years. He laid particular emphasis on their accomplishments in finance. What seemed to loom up largely in his mind was the ability of the Government to borrow money. They had increased the debt from \$350,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000. They had appealed to the people and had obtained their support in a marvellous way—that was a feat to boast of. The Government borrowed from the people of Canada at 5½ per cent interest, giving them an assurance of exemption from taxation, something which never appeared to me to be worth boasting about. Many were the financiers in Canada who thought it was a most imprudent and most dangerous policy to pursue and that it would create a difficult condition and cause violent recriminations in the collection of the Income Tax. They were answered that that was the only way to ensure the success of the loans. My honourable friend has boasted of the last loan, \$700,000,000 which was taken up by the people of Canada. I would ask him to reflect and consider whether that last loan, which was not made free from impost, is not a full condemnation of the previous loans, and of the previous policy followed by the Minister of Finance?

What was that policy based upon? It was a policy which allowed wealthy people to invest their money in loans which would free them from the income tax. What was it based upon, if not a distrust of the people? There was a patriotic duty to perform, and instead of going squarely to the people and telling them that they should take the loans of the Government at 5½ per cent, they lured them to it by the exemption from taxation. The people gave the Government a lesson in patriotism by subscribing \$700,000,000 last autumn without that exemption. To my mind the true test of statesmanship is not to be found in the levying of patriotic loans in Canada. To borrow and to spend lavishly is easy. In my opinion the real test is to be found in demobilizing extravagance. The real test of statesmanship at this moment, is in the restoration of pre-war conditions in all the departments, and in finding ways and means for re-establishing the financial equilibrium. The first duty of the Government after the 18th of November was to see that its house was promptly put in order. One needs