

tain the integrity of the empire on the field of battle. I do not intend to press this point further, but will leave it to the consideration of my right hon. friend; but I do feel that if he wishes to be the exponent of the unqualified sentiment of Canada in every section of the country, he will take every means in his power to show that whether Her Majesty's government will accept the offer or not, Canada stands ready to provide all the expenditure connected with the maintaining of the Canadian force in South Africa. Anything short of that will entirely fail to meet the views of the country.

It is now apparent from the correspondence already down, that no proposal has ever emanated from Canada with regard to that matter. Her Majesty's government have never been pressed to permit Canada to discharge what I believe the overwhelming mass of the people regard as an imperative duty, alike demanded by the honour and interests of our country.

I shall say no more upon that subject, but I wish to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to one of the most extraordinary exhibitions that has perhaps ever been witnessed on the floor of the House of Commons of Canada or of any country where parliamentary government exists. I regard as one of the gravest constitutional scandals that this House, or any House where the British parliamentary system exists, has ever presented, the exhibition which we witnessed on the opening day of the session. What did we see? We saw a gentleman who had resigned his seat in this House on the ground that the government had so trampled the constitution under their feet, had so ignored every principle of constitutional government, that they were no longer deserving of support; and he felt bound, having been elected as one of their supporters, to go before his constituents and denounce their conduct, and defended every point of his case by quoting the absolute dicta of the Prime Minister himself and asked them to sustain him in thus abandoning the party he had been elected to support, and place him in a position to denounce their action on the floor of this House. Sir, can you show me, can any gentleman on the government benches or any gentleman in this House, show me a single instance, in any country where parliamentary government exists or where British institutions are established, in which a man took the extraordinary step of abandoning his party and appealing to his constituents against that party with any other object than that of coming back and driving them out of power if he could? Is it not making a perfect farce of everything like constitutional principles for a man to pretend to abandon the government he has been elected to support and ask his constituents to support his attitude of hostility to them, and then coming back as one of their sup-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

porters in the representative Chamber? Such a farce tends to bring everything like constitutional principles into perfect contempt with the House of Commons and with the whole people. What have we witnessed? We have witnessed the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) taking the very course I speak of. He took, apparently, a very independent, high-handed and dignified course. No doubt he did so under the direction of the members of this government, under the direction, as I believe, I do not hesitate to say, of the Minister of Public Works, and in order to strengthen the French position—not the Canadian French position but the French position—he had taken, and to prevent anything being done to show sympathy with Great Britain in the struggle with the Boers in which she is now entangled. This government was challenged in a most vital point, it was held up to public contempt all over this country by the hon. member for Labelle in a letter of resignation over his own signature, in which he declared that he had no course as an honest representative of the people but to turn his back upon them and turn them out of power. And what followed? This House witnessed a parliamentary and constitutional scandal that, I say, has no parallel in the history of Canada or the British Empire. A man has secured a verdict of his constituents in denouncing the action of the government as a violation of the constitution of the country—the highest crime of which any government can be guilty—The government not having even dared to take up the glove he threw down and put a supporter of their own in the field to defend the position they had taken—and when this man who has denounced them comes back with the unanimous endorsement of his people, the House witnesses the scandal of a Minister of the Crown introducing that man. The hon. member for Labelle, having triumphed over the government, having secured the condemnation of his government by the unanimous vote of his people, we find him introduced to this House by the Minister of Public Works, and sandwiched in between that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet), who is denounced by the most influential portion of the French Canadian press as a thoroughly disloyal man, unentitled to the support of this country. It would not be exactly right to speak of them as *arcades ambo*, for there are three of them; but they are three well associated—

Mr. WALLACE. Three of a kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Three of a kind—yes; men who have taken a position in the face of this parliament calculated to bring upon themselves the utter contempt of every man who has any regard for constitutional government or parliamentary principle. And yet, Sir, we find this Minister of Public Works sitting behind the leader of