

mostly of Swiss who died a military death—died for their country or their pay and they deserve commemoration, but if I understand the meaning of the proposed monument it is not to be erected to the memory of the dead, but as an apotheosis of war and victories. It is a monument that, if those soldiers who are sleeping their last slumber could understand it, would mean glorification for some of them and the reverse for the others. There is no occasion for that. The time for those bitter wars is past, and if we are going to erect monuments, let us raise monuments to the dead without discrimination. Now what inscription is that monument to bear? That is an important question. We have no control over them, apparently. They are going there to erect a costly monument of marble or granite, but what inscription is it going to bear? If those who are going to erect it wish to be true to history, I suppose they will have to portray the one that first landed in the batterie Royale, and who is he? They will have to put the picture of an Indian who was given a bottle of brandy to go and see why it was that there was no cannonading from the French fort and who had the courage, under the influence of his bottle of brandy, to go up to the fort. He saw nobody there, and said, "Hurrah, we have the fort." I suppose he will have the foremost place on the monument, because Louisbourg, being defended by Swiss mostly, and those soldiers not being paid and their rations being very poor, offered no resistance in trying to defend the "batterie Royale" and went away allowing it to be taken with all the ammunition and all the guns, and the one who took it was an Indian from Massachusetts, not one of our Indians, who are temperance people. What next? Will Peppercell's chaplain be depicted on one of the four faces of the monument—because there will be four faces—waiving an axe in his hand and announcing that he is going to that French fortress to "demolish the cross and other emblems of idolatry?" I suppose so, if these gentlemen wish to be historical. Will they also mention in the inscription on the monument that four hundred men who were sent out, after the taking of the fort, to destroy all the French settlements and houses in Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island, did most fully and most religiously perform their work amongst a peaceful population? I suppose that the episode will also be inscribed on the monument. And,

since it is a commemoration of a great deed, will they also recall the fact that the taking of Louisbourg was accompanied by very few fatalities? However, after the fortress was taken, as is shown by the report of Governor Shirley himself, within a very short time, 890 colonial soldiers did die within the fortress of Louisbourg; but not from the effects of balls and bullets, nor from cannons, but from other causes which history will tell, and which, for fear of scandalizing our temperance people, I will refrain from mentioning. I suppose those foreigners are going to commemorate all that; and they will have to do so if they wish to be true to history. It is not worth while to erect a monument to recall such feats, and if there is any way of preventing it, either by an expression of public opinion or the action of the imperial authorities or of this government and making those people, who seem to have no sense of international decency, understand that while there is nothing exceedingly harmful in their actions, there is something unseemly and uncalled for and would be rendering them a service indeed. We know the actual sentiment of some of those New England States towards England by the resolutions they have recently passed anent the Nicaragua troubles, I do not see why we should allow these very men to come here and erect a monument on our land, against the peace of British subjects and Canadian citizens. Therefore, on behalf of a large portion of the people of the maritime provinces I protest against the erection of a monument glorifying the action of the colonists in the taking of Louisbourg in 1745, as unnecessary, uncalled for, highly improper and offensive.

. Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—
In reply to the hon. gentleman, who has made a very interesting and historical speech, I can inform him that, so far as we know, the scheme for the erection of a monument in commemoration of the taking of Louisbourg in 1745, by the militia of the state of Massachusetts, originated with a historical society formed in Boston and in the neighbouring localities, of which the Canadian Government had no knowledge, nor was its consent asked. The government have no knowledge what inscription is to be placed on the monument. The Department of Militia and Defence has no