

to take part in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Yes, but you got the Speaker's eye.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—If I am on my feet now it is because I am impelled to do so as a protest against the speech to which we have just listened. I do not know of any one single thing that has been said by my hon. friend from Grandville with which I agree, or rather from which I do not thoroughly dissent. I might perhaps qualify that and say that the only observation my hon. friend has made with which I agree is his own remark that his speech carried him too far. Let me first extend my individual congratulations to those who have already been offered such congratulations, my hon. friend who moved and my hon. friend who seconded the Address. They have done so in a way which was expected of them, in a way that is creditable to them, and at the same time very hopefully for the future usefulness of those hon. gentlemen in this House. I welcome their advent to the Senate, and I welcome also the advent of the other two gentlemen who were sworn in on the first day. In rising to reply to the speech which was delivered by my hon. friend from Grandville, I perhaps presume more than I should; because I propose to speak very largely, not only for myself, but for all those of French speech in the Senate, and I hope that what I shall say, in fact I have good reason to believe that what I shall say will meet with the approval of my French compatriots who with myself have the honour of holding seats in this House, whether they sit on this side or the other side of the House. If I presume too much I shall ask them to tell me so later on.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Why not the English?

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT—I am sure that every hon. member of this House, as well as the ladies and gentlemen who were privileged to hear it, noticed with what unusual solemnity and emotion the royal representative of the Crown read the speech which the ministers of the day had prepared for him and more especially that part of it having reference to the present world war. And in doing so I think His Royal Highness was merely the echo of the feelings of Canadians, wherever they live, whether

on the Atlantic or the Pacific, in whatever province they may reside. The speech from the Throne, delivered, as I say, with unusual solemnity and emotion, was only the echo of what was uppermost in our minds, and was down deepest in our hearts—that is, our supreme, our paramount concern in the gigantic war, which at this time is engaging on one side all the forces of civilization, and on the other all the destructive agencies of anti-civilization. I felt when the speech was being read that every one present would, if allowed the opportunity, have applauded, and expressed to His Royal Highness the conviction that he was also expressing his own sentiment. The hon. gentleman from Grandville has covered a great deal of ground, a great deal of irrelevant and mischievous ground. In the very few moments I propose to occupy addressing the Senate it will be impossible for me to go over the whole of his speech. In any case it is of no great consequence that one should do so. He has said many things with which we, or nearly all of us, disagree, things which are most thoughtless, puerile and inconsistent. The latter part of his speech, it seemed to me, may not have been intended, but it would have the result at all events of practically destroying what he had said before. The hon. gentleman took considerable time in trying to prove to us—and he might as well try to prove that two and two make five—that the responsibility of the war was with England. I never heard anybody else with sense in his head make that statement. Why, for days and days Sir Ed. Grey refused to make the declaration of war when Germany was hoping that England would declare war. He exhausted every effort that ingenuity, patience and long-protracted foreign experience gave him to prevent war taking place, and yet we have an hon. gentleman in this House who has been in public life for years, making the statement that the responsibility was at England's door. The proposition is so absurd, and the falsity of it so absolutely demonstrated, that it is almost a waste of time to argue to the contrary. What would any of us have thought, what would any man who is accustomed to British freedom and liberty, and British honour and dignity, and British traditions and British practice have thought if England had not come to the rescue of little Belgium, if England had

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT.