

ing more farms, in ravishing more women and starving more children for the everlasting glory of 'Cæsar, Imperator et deus'. Rome held a vaster empire, her provinces were better subdued, she boasted more of her power on the eve of her downfall than at any other period of her history. But we know now, and her clear-sighted citizens knew then, that the time of her greatest moral and material strength was when her statesmen thought more of curing evils at home and of keeping the old Roman spirit of liberty, than of plundering the world and worshipping brutal force and insatiable greed in the person of the Emperor.

But I do not want to add fuel to the fire of jingo feelings. I will simply remind the members of the House, those especially who are most proud of the position we occupy in the empire, that, if we do not want Canada to be considered by the British government as a mere colonial field for profitable speculation, it is most urgent that we should make ourselves respected not only on the battlefield, but also in His Majesty's councils. The time has come when we should tell Mr. Chamberlain that, having had at leisure and unreservedly the blood of our blood and the flesh of our flesh, the tears of Canadian mothers and the sweat of Canadian farmers and workers, in order to enrich himself and his brother and his son, and the whole of his tribe, by selling guns and ammunition, he should at least respect the language of the Canadian people, and not distort as he pleases the documents which are sent to him by the Canadian government.

I exposed before the House, at the last session, the strange course followed by the Colonial Secretary; his using our Transvaal resolution of 1899 to say that we were in favour of his provoking and arrogant policy; his acceptance of our offers of help before they had ever been tendered; the publication by the London papers of his official despatch to Lord Minto before it had reached our government; and above all, his insolent reply to the order in council of October 13th. Since then, we have had another manifestation of the growing audacity of the master of the empire. Last year, on the 4th of June, I put the following question to the government:

Has the government, or any of its members, been consulted as to the conditions upon which the South African war should be settled? Is it the intention of the government to offer any suggestion or opinion on the matter?

To which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) replied:

Neither the government, nor any of its members, have been consulted as to conditions upon which the South African war should be settled. They are not considering the advisability of offering any suggestion or opinion upon the matter.

And the reply was noisily applauded by the

opposition. This session, on the 18th of February, I put the following question:

1. Was the Canadian government, or any of its members, consulted by the British government on the South African question since the 1st of June last?

2. Did the Canadian government, or any of its members, offer any opinion or make any suggestion to the British government on the matter?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Canadian government was not consulted, nor any of its members, by the British government on the South African question since June 1st last. No member of the Canadian government offered any opinion on the matter.

Let us now cross the ocean, enter Westminster Palace, the mother of parliaments, the source and safeguard of British liberty, of British justice, of British truth. On the 7th day of August last—I read from the Times' parliamentary report:

Mr. Faber (York) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, considering the part taken by Canada and Australia in the South African war, it was proposed to ascertain the views of the government of those countries in regard to the settlement and government of the Transvaal and Orange State when the war was over.

And remembering the declarations made by the Prime Minister of Canada on the 4th of June, 1900, and on the 18th of February, 1901, let us hear the reply of the oracle of the new British world:

Mr. Chamberlain.—I have already made myself acquainted with the views of the colonies of Canada and Australia in regard to the main points of the future settlement, and Her Majesty's government are in complete accordance with them as to the necessity for annexation, the establishment of a government supported by military force, with the ultimate expectation of an extension to both colonies of representative self-government. (Cheers.)

Yes, cheers on both sides of the Atlantic, —but which is which?

One would be tempted to qualify such a flagrant contradiction in terms that would call for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But, after all, this was not much worse than when being told officially that the Canadian government were permitting the enlistment of the first contingent because they considered that the colony was not committed to any future action, the Colonial Secretary replied officially that the British government were accepting our troops as an evidence of our willingness 'to share in the risks and burdens of the empire,' and as a proof of our sympathy with his policy in South Africa. That first distortion having been tacitly accepted here, the Colonial Secretary was only encouraged in his methods. But I think it justifies me in appealing to the members of this House in the name of Canadian self-respect to put a stop to that arbitrary treatment. I appeal to those at least who have not reached that point of devotion to Mr. Chamberlain that to be made tools of in his