

South Africa. I shall never admit that the country could be thrown in any war by order in council. I shall never acknowledge that the government was excusable, for the sake of power or popularity; or even in order to avoid the nightmare of racial agitation, to open, by a mere cabinet decision, a new era in our relations with Great Britain, without at least enlightening the people upon the real consequences of their action. I still assert that Canada is not bound and should not be called to any other military action than the defence of her territory.

Such principles being reserved, there is no necessity for my insisting any more upon them at present. The point I want to make is this: We, Canadians, have been taxed, some wilfully and some forcibly, to defray the cost of this expedition; we have, therefore, the right to pronounce on the outcome and the settlement of the conflict in which we have been made a party, and we should not allow the British government to presume and decide arbitrarily of our opinion without even consulting us on the matter. As I have stated when I moved my anti-Imperialist resolution last year; as I repeated the other day in support of the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) requesting the abolition of the anti-Catholic declaration forced upon the King on the day of his coronation: I believe it is our right and duty, as representatives of a self-governing British community, to express an opinion and to make suggestions on any matter of vital interest to British power—provided always we impair in no way our full liberty and complete self-control of action.

Strange to say, no traces of Imperialism were pointed out in the help given by Canada to soldiers wounded in the Crimean war; nor in the part played by Sir John A. Macdonald in the settlement of the Alabama claim at the expense of Canada; nor in the three resolutions in favour of home rule for Ireland discussed in this parliament; nor even in the motion of sympathy with the gold miners and speculators of the Transvaal adopted by this House at the request of Mr. Rhodes's agent. But now, Imperialism is declared to be the basis of a proposition asking that a conflict in which we have taken an active part should be settled upon the same principles that have made Canada happy and prosperous and which this parliament wanted, some years ago, to be applied to Ireland. Stranger still, I am told that Canada has not the right to say that an end should be put to a war in which her required contribution of 500 men has been raised to over 3,000, and her national expenditure of a few thousand dollars to more than two millions. And finally when British authorities are unable to find police recruits in the United Kingdom, in New Zealand and in Australia, when the Cape Colonists themselves, for the benefit of whom that force is organized, refuse

to enlist—I am denied by Imperialists and by anti-Imperialists as well the right to say that Sir Alured Milner and Mr. Chamberlain should not have been allowed and helped to play any longer upon the candid and enthusiastic naivety of Canadians.

The principles upon which I have based this proposition are not new; they were born with the British nation itself; they were brought by the Saxon pirates from the dark forests of Teutonia to the Celtic island of the north; they were laid down as the corner-stone of the British constitution by a section of that robust Norman race of which the French Canadians are to-day, perhaps, the most direct and thorough offsprings. Many a blow was struck at them; they were reddened by the blood of powerful assailants and of heroic defenders; I hope they will stand the present craze as they stood the attacks of monarchs and mobs, of oligarchists and aristocrats. I mean the right, for all British subjects, of petition and remonstrance to the Crown, and the right of directing the use that shall be made of their money.

The new Imperialism is the very antithesis of these rights. The tendency of Mr. Chamberlain's ideas, favoured, either wilfully or blindly, by most colonial public men, is to centralize gradually the political, military and economical ruling of the empire, making it as free as possible from independent local action. In order to set asleep the susceptibilities of the Canadian or of the Australian, and to kill their colonial vanity by swelling their jingoistic pride, it is whispered that the capital of the new empire may not stay where it is. But that does not matter: whether worshipped at London or at Toronto, at Melbourne or at Calcutta, the Buddha of the Imperialists will remain the same omnipotent fetic, and the choir of the faithful shall have to howl the same hymn. One of the most remarkable features of the new Britishism is that the more he swells in ambition the less tolerant he grows towards differing convictions.

It has been said, printed and sung on all tures for over a year, that this war has raised the past subservient state of British self-governing colonies to the rank of free nations allied with Great Britain. Eloquent periods have been thrown to the four winds, celebrating the proud position which we occupy now in the British Empire.

Those triumphant effusions of colonial pride recall forcibly to my mind the decadent years of the Roman empire, when poets and rhetors, forgetful of the rude but free life of their forefathers, were extolling the glories of Cæsar and worshipping his golden image, because they were allowed to share in his refined debaucheries; because the old warriors of Gaul and Brittany, of Iberia and Germania had become the best legionaries of the empire, and could help in conquering more lands, in looting more herds, in burn-