

Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen, and so it is, notwithstanding the speeches of the hon. gentleman, which sent so many to Kansas and other parts of the United States. I spoke of the climate of Canada; I said up to the North Pole—aye, Sir, from the boundary line to the North Pole, be the climate frosty or genial, or be the soil fertile or unfertile, there is no portion of the Dominion of Canada that is liable to the malignant fevers which exist in other countries. We have no Texas fever in Canada; we have no Kansas complaints; our very animals seem to be protected by Providence from the diseases that ravage the herds and flocks of other countries. It is the style of the hon. gentleman, as it is of those who support him, to take every opportunity to lessen the reputation and the position of Canada in the world. Sir, I spoke the simple truth when I said that every acre of the Dominion of Canada had a healthful climate, which man, woman and child could emigrate to and could prosper in. The hon. gentleman also alluded to my over-patriotic views. He intimated, in fact, that I was kotouing to the Mother Country—seeking favor there by saying that Canada would expend her last man in the defence of the Empire. I know that hon. gentleman would not be one of those who would spend his shilling or put his musket to his shoulder for that purpose, no more than the hon. member for Centre Quebec (Mr. Laurier) would do so; I know neither of them would do so; and they laugh, I dare say, in their sleeves at my quixotry in saying that England, in case of distress, in case of danger, in case of the perils of war, would find Canadians ready to do what they could to back the sovereignty of England. But, Sir, my speech was not simply an expression that we would spend our last shilling and our last man. My speech was in favor of having such an arrangement between the central United Kingdom and all the colonies—having an arrangement made by which the auxiliary kingdom of Canada and the auxiliary kingdom of Australasia should together form one great empire, and by uniting their forces, by uniting their men and their money, should together be so strong as an empire that they would control the world in arms. That was my statement; I have made it in this House; I have made it in former Houses. Wherever I have had an opportunity of speaking on that subject, I have stated that the future of the Empire of Great Britain depended upon a close and intimate alliance between the central power and the dependencies, the auxiliary kingdoms; and, Sir, I believe if it were put to the electors at the polls in the Dominion of Canada—if they were polled, men and women—and on that point the women ought to get the franchise, because they would be the most loyal of all—the hon. gentleman would find that he would be in a miserable minority if he proposed to draw back from any well organised scheme by which the Mother Country and the children kingdoms were united in one great force to maintain the civilisation of the world—to maintain the superior civilisation of those people who are contained within the bounds of the great Empire to which we are proud to belong. The hon. gentleman also tried to get a cheer by stating that I said the French would not come here because if they did we would appeal to the United States to protect us. I said no such thing; that was a garbling of what I stated. What I stated was this: that in consequence of sensational articles that were published in England, emanating from the press of the United States, apprehensions prevailed in England—that fostered by these articles distrust was raised in the minds of the English people, the English Government and the English Parliament. I found when I got to England that they had made some impression on the minds of the people there. They said: "Is it true what the New York Herald and other papers say, that the French Canadians are going to rise in arms, that they are watching an opportunity of severing their connection with Canada and

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

that no dependence can be placed on their loyalty?" I took upon myself, from a knowledge of 40 years of the French Canadians, to deny that statement. I stated then that there was no portion of Her Majesty's subjects, no matter what their origin or their language might be, more loyal to this Empire, more loyal to the Crown of England, than the French Canadians; and I stated further, in answer to the apprehension that was entertained and expressed, again and again, in some of the English press, that even if the French Canadians were loyal, even if they did not desire to sever the connection between England and Canada, yet that at this moment the French republic were seeking colonies restlessly, opening, new and extensive, a restless and an aggressive colonial policy, there was no need to fear that France would attempt to intrigue with the French Canadians, because French statesmen know too well, from the experience they found in Mexico, when Maximilian came over, with a generous but mistaken ambition, to found a State in Mexico, what the consequence was. The United States said to the French Government: "You must retire; no European monarchy can get a new footing on this continent; no European Government can come in this North America. That was the Monroe doctrine, and the knowledge of that would prevent the possibility of the French Government or Frenchmen, instigated by the French Government, trying to intrigue and raise a spirit of disloyalty which is now un-existent among the descendants of Frenchmen happily living in Canada. That was the language I used, and I must ask my French Canadian friends, those opposed to the Government as well as those supporting it, if I do not express the sentiments of the French Canadians. Certainly, I may not express the sentiments of one of them, the hon. member for Quebec.

Mr. LAURIER. Order; the hon. gentleman has no reason to impute to me such imputations as he does.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I impute no imputations.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, you are charging me with disloyalty.

Mr. BOWELL. You said you would take up arms.

An hon. MEMBER. He stood his ground, he did not run away.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he never went ahead or returned; that is all the difference. Now, I have defended, in my humble, feeble way, the remarks I made in England. I do not believe they are misapprehended by those who do not wish to misapprehend them; they are so plain they could not be misapprehended. There is one quotation the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) made, which is evidently a mistake, when he said I declared we were forming a navy. I said we were forming an army, but certainly not a navy. We have formed an army of citizen soldiery who have shown they are an army fit to rank and march side by side with the forces of England. But while the hon. gentleman insinuates that my speech was extra-loyal, extra-effusive, and far too patriotic, in the English sense, I cannot make the same charge with regard to his speech, near Edinburgh, when he was the guest of Lord Roseberry. No such charge can be brought against him. True, he told them that politically we were far in advance of them; that we had adopted a liberal, radical system in Canada, which they were fondly hoping to imitate bye-and-bye. But, in that long and eloquent speech, and I read it with much pleasure, because it accurately stated man instances in which Canada, in its legislation, free as it is or the trammels of an old conventionality and an old monarchy—

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—had made advances in many questions which still remain difficulties to solve in