

dict and say they are not true; weight would not be carried by my words. But I have no less authority than the Professor of Colonial History in Queens University for saying that in the unwinding of the tangle incidental to Maine and Vermont, he is able to prove that the Mother Country got for us rather more than we were entitled to. Then we have the case of Oregon. Each country had historical claim, and fought for it with vigour. It is within your memory, Sir, how a great party in the United States attained power by the cry of 54:40 or fight. They did not get 54:40 and they did not fight. The President of the day would have fought, but he could not carry the Senate with him, the reason being that they had a war on their hands with Mexico that took up their entire energy. The point I wish to make is that Britain took the stand: we will fight if we have to, but we are going to have what is fair—and Canada got what was fair.

Another argument, which was used in the election recently held in Hochelaga is that England was recreant to her trust and to Canada in that she did not, at the time when the North and South were in the clutches of their struggle, strike a crushing blow at the North. Can one conceive a more Machiavelian impropriety than that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: That England owed no duty to the United States, a nation with whom she was on the friendliest terms, but was recreant to Canada because she did not break every rule of international law and strike a friend when she was in trouble. Let us assume that that would have been a correct policy. What would become of Canada if she depended on principles of that sort? What would become of Canada if England were in trouble and other nations assumed that as a straight and honest foreign policy?

Another point is raised. They tell me that if the policy of the right hon. leader of the Government prevails we shall divide Canada into two parts, that we shall have Quebec on the one hand and the English speaking provinces on the other. I cannot believe these foretellers of such dire forebodings.

My mind goes back in history to the time when, in 1775, the revolting American colonies used every wile to win the French Canadians from their allegiance to the British Crown; my memory goes back through history to the war of 1812, when French Canadian blood watered the lower provinces for the maintenance of British supremacy; history tells us how, in 1840, the French Canadian people, more numer-

Mr. NICKLE.

ous than the people of Upper Canada, threw in their lot with us for a united parliament in order to better the conditions of Canada; and again, if more recent allusion is necessary, I have not forgotten that, in 1867, Canada, from one end to the other, united, with hardly a dissenting voice, in so far as the provinces were concerned, to bring about Confederation.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat, has drawn attention to the fact that it is his privilege and mine to represent the constituencies which were at one time represented by Cartier and Macdonald, and, Mr. Speaker, in that fact, we, or at least I, feel a tremendous responsibility. It is not the responsibility of a man who ever expects to do much in politics, but it is the responsibility of doing well the little we have to do. And if my hon. friend and myself represent in that way the union of these races, there is no antagonism between Quebec and the other provinces. Canada is a united Canada from one end to the other.

You may say that there is a menace, or that there is not a menace, that the British Colonial policy was a poor policy or was a good policy, that we owe nothing to England for anything which she has done for us; but, Sir, when the last word is said, when the last argument is advanced, the question we have to answer in this Parliament is this: is the British Empire worth preserving? If the British Empire is not worth preserving, if it has outlived the sphere of its usefulness, then let it follow the other empires of the world and go into oblivion; but, if the British Empire is worth preserving, let us see that we do our part. Some one has said that Rome was the lone mother of dead empires. But Britain is the loved mother of living nations. She has realized what the protection of her great empire means as no other world power has ever done. I am not blind to the picturesqueness of nationalism. Being Scotch, my blood thrills at the efforts of the Scottish people to maintain their independence against the aggression of their southern neighbours. I can appreciate the literature, the philosophy and the culture of Greece, and I understand that the union of the German provinces was brought about that the people of that country might have fuller opportunity for national development and advancement. The term 'Empire', in the working out of the problems of diplomacy, has been given a new and fuller meaning by British statesmen. I am an imperialist and I believe that, in the proper acceptance of the term, the great majority of the members of this House are Imperialists; Imperialists in the sense that we realize that the British nation has still a great work to do, not in wars of aggression,