

# THROUGH A MONOCLE

## THE TALK THAT KILLS

WHEN Parliament meets, the elements of the situation will be very simple. Either the Opposition will be determined to force an election on the Reciprocity issue, or they will not. In either case, there is no need to waste time. If the Opposition propose to obstruct until the Government feel themselves driven to dissolution, the Opposition are perfectly able to make a success of this policy. With freedom of debate, the Government cannot force "Supply" through the House with sufficient speed to carry on "the King's business" if the Opposition are minded to prevent it. The Government have, indeed, already met this possibility very frankly. They have said, not once or twice, but many times, that if the Opposition want an election this autumn on Reciprocity, they can have it. This being the case, why should the country be put to the expense of a visible demonstration that the Opposition can do, what everybody admits they can do, before the natural result follows.

WHAT is wanted is just a little frankness. If Mr. Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier will get together, they might settle the whole business in a few sentences—something after this sort. Mr. Borden might say: "Well, Sir Wilfrid, are you still determined to put Reciprocity through?" When Sir Wilfrid replied: "Certainly," then Mr. Borden could answer: "Sorry to have to say it; but we feel it our duty to employ every constitutional means to prevent you." "Oh, very well," Sir Wilfrid could counter; "Have you any preference for an election date?" Then Parliament could vote as much Supply as is needed to carry the country over the elections, proceed to some other measures for which the people are waiting, adopt a Redistribution bill when the census is ready, and then "open the ball."

WE do not particularly need much more Reciprocity debating. A few speeches by the leaders would bring the subject up to date; and then the rest of the members could reserve their fire for their constituents when they get on the "stump." An election should not come—if it can be prevented at all, until Parliament has a chance to see the full returns of the census and to redistribute the constituencies in accordance with its figures. This forbids immediate appeal to the people. But there is plenty of work for Parliament to do in the meantime; and, if any one has a contribution of genuine value to make to the Reciprocity discussion, it will be quite possible for him to get it in during the short debate which is inevitable—or to make it at a public meeting outside the halls of Parliament. What the country ought to be saved from is the very considerable expense of a purely obstructive debate. The Opposition should be given, and, indeed, cannot well be denied, the fullest chance to say what it wants to say; and the Government should put up the best and most convincing defence it can muster. But when all that is done, then the rest should be "taken as read." The Opposition ought not to be required to show that they really can obstruct before the Government accepts the situation and promises dissolution just as soon as a redistribution measure can pass.

THE men on either side who believe that the policy of their party touching Reciprocity is popular, will naturally be opposed to compelling an obstructive debate on the subject. Only those who fear that their party stands to lose by its policy on Reciprocity, and who would like to see the country so sickened of the subject that it would insist upon being talked to regarding other issues during the campaign, can be in favour of a wearying round of "damnable iteration" on this theme in order to prove the admitted. But those who fight for their party's policy touching this matter "con amore," must see that they stand to lose by tiring the people of the subject. And nothing will tire the people so quickly as a long string of speeches openly and boastfully intended to do no more than "kill time." It will, however, do much more than kill time—it will kill the issue.

IT may be said that no one wants to make up his mind at Ottawa until the American Senators have made up their's. In that case, the situation is equally simple. The debate on the Fielding resolutions can be delayed until the American Senate has voted. Such a step could not be fairly charged against our

Government as an act of bad faith. It has shown abundantly its good faith in the matter already. It has committed itself to stand or fall by Reciprocity if it be carried in its present form at Washington. It has a majority in the House. So if the Ministers come back from the Coronation and find that the Americans have not yet made up their minds whether they want Reciprocity as it stands, they would only be acting as business men if they quietly proceeded to some of the other important public business which is waiting, and let it be known that they proposed to go on with Reciprocity from day to day the moment the American Senate gave its assent to the measure. Only the most superficial study of the situation would lead to the conclusion that, as the American Lower House has carried it, our Lower House should carry it too; and send it up to the Senate to await the decision of the American Senate. At Washington, the Senate is the

## A MONUMENT TO A GREAT CANADIAN

YOU have been in Quebec, walked on the Terrace with the band playing, and gazed up proudly at the heroic figure of Champlain by Paul Chevre. Thousands of tourists annually admire Chevre's statue of the early French explorer. If you have



Chevre's drawing of the monument to the Canadian historian Garneau, to be erected on the grounds of the Quebec Legislature.

any feeling for Canadian history, the significance of the gallant figure strikes you at once, his cloak parading almost flamboyantly over his sword hilt, as imperious he stands at the gates of a Dominion. Chevre has done in clay some of the immortals of the French regime in Canada. He is now at work on a statue of the greatest of French-Canadian historians, Francois Xavier Garneau, which has been presented to the Quebec Government by Colonel George E. Amyot, the well-known merchant of the historic city on the St. Lawrence.

Garneau is a name probably better known and cherished by the citizens of Lower Canada than those of the rest of the Dominion. But he is one of the great names in Canadian literature. His work was largely in the field of history, though he did write some patriotic verse, as French-Canadian literateurs not uncommonly do at some period or

governing House; at Ottawa, it is the House of Commons.

\* \* \*

HOWEVER, the point I want to make is that the country should be spared a purely obstructive debate. Nothing could be more unprofitable, and nothing could more effectively dilute the value of the verdict which the country is about to be asked to pronounce upon the first important issue which has been presented to it for many a day. The election cannot come until late in the autumn—the Opposition would be very wrong to try to force an election before a redistribution—and we all, surely, desire that the voters shall then approach the serious and final consideration of this great subject with as much zest and appetite as can be managed. All the facts should be then before us. What is wanted is an alert, wide-awake, keen public interest in the question; and that we can rob ourselves of in no other way quite so effectively as by keeping the Commons marking time for weeks and weeks in a deadly dull, time-killing, member-killing, interest-killing obstructive debate on Reciprocity—Reciprocity—Reciprocity.

THE MONOCLE MAN.

other of their careers. Whatever now may be the merits of Francois Xavier Garneau's "Histoire du Canada, depuis sa decouverte jusqu'a nos jours"—which days came to a close in 1866—in the light of more modern research into the annals of Canada, the author's name will always be remembered because he stood for something. He infused a new spirit into the historical writings of his part of the country. He tried to cast aside the trammels of partisanship, and note impartially the record of Canada.

How he came to form this new conception of Canadian history is the story of Garneau's own life. Francois Xavier Garneau was born in the year 1809, of parents poor, but of distinguished lineage. He grew up in Quebec amid the strife of racial conflict between French and English. When he became a young man, thinking on politics and society, and feverish to express his thoughts, he shrugged his shoulders and refused to be dominated by his environment. He wanted to be above it.

At some time or other in a struggling youth, he became articled to a notary. In this office were both English and French clerks—two heated factions. The story is well known of how, taunted by the insinuations of the English chaps, and disgusted with hide-bound partisanship of his fellow French, during a dispute over some historical event in the Conquest of Canada, he cried in youthful ardour that he would write the truth. And what he wrote was not truth as coloured by himself, but revealed to him in the deeds of the past.

The statue of Garneau will be unveiled in September of next year. It will stand in the vicinity of the Parliament Buildings, Quebec, seventeen feet high, a monument of bronze. The donor, Lieut.-Colonel Amyot, is one of the leading manufacturers in Quebec, one time president of the C. M. A.—a man with an eye to the past as well as to the future of his city.

Paul Chevre, the artist, is a man with an international reputation. In France he is a scholar of Cavelier and Barrias, and a frequent prize-winner at the Salon. His best known dramatic work is the familiar group of two roosters and a boy inciting them to fight. Of the "Cock Fight," two hundred reproductions have been sold. His treatment of classical subjects, such as his statues of "La Bacchante," "Echo," and "Youth," have been recognized by leading connoisseurs in Europe and America. He has taken considerable interest in Canada. His bust of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is a good piece of work. Besides the monument to Francois Garneau, Mr. Chevre is completing one to the late Hon. Mr. Mercier.

A monument such as that to F. X. Garneau is a much more sensible and educative benefaction than a Drinking Fountain, and is likely to be more of an inspiration to a populace than a chair in a college or building a pipe organ in a church.



M. PAUL CHEVRE  
Sculptor of the Garneau monument.