

ing redress for their grievances against the Administration previous to holding the moneys required for the public service.

So this resolution puts us face to face with a most grievous situation and a most perilous one to the future of the parliamentary institutions of this country. It is the indisputable right of us, Liberals, at all times, and in all places, friends and trusted defenders of liberty, to denounce that resolution in the strongest terms and to draw the attention of the people to the tyranny of which we are the victims, as members of the Opposition, and which is an infringement on our constitutional liberties.

On the Government benches this plot was laid down towards ensuring the adoption of this resolution, the object and outcome of which is to deprive the Canadian people of their rights, by doing away with freedom of speech in this Parliament. That plot was evolved and worked out by the Tory-Conservative party, and how painful to think that it was the work of the advisors of His Majesty. Should not the prestige inseparable from those lofty attributes be secured against anything which might detract from it? Should there not be attached to it a nobleness of demeanour which adds to its lustre, a courage which increases in proportion to difficulties and which, at any rate, never thinks of resorting to expedients and never seeks as its extreme way out of difficulties violence and brute force?

Is that the estimate which future generations will make of our present ministers? I doubt it very much. Will they not say as already the present generations is whispering, at the sight of what is going on before their eyes that they were not courageous, that the mantle of the statesman did not fit them, that they were short-sighted and without an ideal, that the first serious difficulty which opposed their progress so discouraged them that they had recourse to the most extreme and even despotic measures to stifle the voices which they were unable to silence. But these voices of the Opposition will not be stifled until mine, however humble, is raised to protest with all my might against the violence we are subjected to, to protest in my name and also on behalf of the thousands of electors whom I represent here. I feel it is an imperious duty which I am fulfilling in their name, I feel that I am meeting the wishes of my constituents, I feel that I am doing homage also to that liberty which we can never cherish too much, which we can never defend too ardently.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, whenever a power abuses its strength and interferes with some franchise, whatever that power may be, and whatever that franchise may

Mr. LACHANCE

consist in, every citizen has the right, and the imperious duty as well, to raise his voice in protest.

So it is with a view to protesting that I rise just now. And in rising, it is not only in my name that I protest against the blow which is aimed at freedom of speech; it is also in the name of those honest people whom I have the honour of representing here.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that my protest will not change matters. A majority, which rests more confidence in its strength than in its rights, has decided that freedom of speech should be done away with, so that it may have a freer hand in destroying the autonomy of Canada.

I know that the deed will be consummated and that it is only a question of hours. A reprieve may be hoped for, but not a commutation of the sentence of death pronounced against liberty. But before liberty dies, it is only right that she should know who are those who demanded that a death warrant be issued against her. History, that impartial avenger will be able to descry the true friends of justice and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, the grounds taken to justify the action of the Government in proposing this resolution which does away with freedom of speech, are all more or less futile; they prove only one thing: the assurance which the Government has of a moral defeat, should there be a referendum, or of an actual overthrow, should there be an election.

So it may be said that freedom of speech is sacrificed, not in order to permit an act of generosity towards the Mother Country, not to favour the defence of the Empire on account of some emergency which might become more pressing as days go by, not on a question of principle, but purely and simply on account of the fright—a blue fright—experienced by the Government at the thought of the outcome of an election or of a referendum.

Mr. Speaker, Liberals have been charged with carrying on a disloyal obstruction against this government measure. That charge is foundationless. The Government has based its proposal on facts which are more than questionable; since it was unable to support its contention, in regard to an emergency for instance, the only thing for it to do, was to withdraw that hateful proposal, a danger to the autonomy of our country, and a most dangerous precedent to enact. So the Liberals were justified in opposing this plan by all means available under the constitution. The ardent struggle, strenuous at times, and at all times, painful, which we have gone through, shows too well how desperately the Government is intent on getting this scheme through the House.

In vain, a sensible element of the British