

happened? While the right hon. gentleman was declaring that this was a war of justice, a holy war, in which Canada was bound to take part by coming to the aid and support of Her Majesty's government, his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was addressing the people at St. Vincent de Paul. The Minister of Public Works there violated the first principles of parliamentary and constitutional government by holding up in his hand what he declared was the Order in Council permitting this contingent to go, and declared that he had forced his colleagues to put into that Order in Council the declaration that it should never be done again. Let me quote the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works:

And it is because these words, 'it is not to be a precedent,' are in the Order in Council, it is because I, for my part, requested them, and I say it aloud and I say it to the country, that I am denounced as disloyal.

Why should he not be denounced as disloyal for taking this line of conduct, when the representative of the Crown in New South Wales, the Governor of New South Wales, was sending this message to the Queen regarding the contingent which New South Wales had sent:

The people of this colony will be ready always to share the duties and responsibilities of Her Majesty's Empire.

When New South Wales was covering itself, in the eyes of every patriotic man within the bounds of the British Empire, with honour, by declaring that what it had done on this occasion it would always be ready to do, whenever the interests of the great Empire required it, the Minister of Public Works was shaking this Order in Council before the people and boasting that he had forced his colleagues to put into it the reservation that what had been done would not be done again, and that no precedent would be established.

At St. Vincent de Paul the hon. Minister of Public Works further said:

I call the attention of the Canadian electorate to the fact that in the debate which then took place, not one member of parliament suggested the idea of sending troops to the Transvaal to aid England. Sir Charles Tupper was in his seat when that resolution was passed.

The hon. gentleman was mistaken in that assertion, because at the time I happened to be in Toronto. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

Sir Charles Tupper was surrounded by his colleagues, and I repeat, not a member suggested the idea of sending the Canadian troops to the Transvaal.

Did the hon. gentleman read my letter sent to the First Minister on the occasion, in which I committed myself fully and un-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

equivocally to the position that it was the duty of this government to send aid to Her Majesty's forces. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) gave the hon. gentleman an emphatic contradiction in that very illogical and contradictory speech of which he was so proud as to have it published in pamphlet form and distributed for the purpose of carrying the elections in the province of New Brunswick and Sherbrooke. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) said at Campbellton on the 21st November, 1890:

In adopting that resolution, there were none, I think, who did not consider—

I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to these words:

—that it involved an expression, at least, of willingness on the part of Canada to aid the empire should the need for our assistance arise.

So that the hon. Minister of Public Works was contradicted, not only by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), but by his colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, who sympathized with him to a considerable extent in this matter.

Again, look at the hon. gentleman's baneful influence on the right hon. gentleman's colleagues. Last year the right hon. gentleman boasted in this House that he had at his back his French colleagues as a unit. But how does he stand to-day? Under the potent, malign influence of the Minister of Public Works he stands in this position, that a number of his strong supporters of yesterday are to-day denouncing his conduct as unconstitutional and pledging themselves all over the country that they will oppose any conduct of the kind. The hon. member for the St. James Division of Montreal (Mr. Desmarais), speaking to the East End Liberal Club of that city, on October 11, said:

I do not fear to say that the Laurier government would be seriously blamed by the electorate if it approved of such a measure (sending a Canadian contingent to the Transvaal), and I, for one, would rise on the floor of the House, as member for St. James Division, if such a proposal were brought before parliament, and signify my disapproval.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman will change his mind; but, in view of such statements made by members of parliament representing important sections of this country, in view of the position taken by them of determined, unqualified antagonism, following the wake of the Minister of Public Works, to the policy propounded, is it possible for the hon. gentleman to say truthfully—and if it cannot be said truthfully, it only invites unfavourable comment—that there is entire accord, that his action has proved the loyalty and devotion of the entire people to the British Crown and British institutions?