

And what had been done by these gentlemen whom *La Patrie* denounces, what had they done? These gentlemen had had the courage of their convictions to say that they believed that considering the position which England occupied, it was the duty of the government of Canada to come to the aid of the mother country, and to give effect to the declaration which the House of Commons of Canada and the Senate of Canada had by unanimous vote placed upon their journals.

Mr. BERGERON. And the government did it afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, and the government did it afterwards. And, Sir, the moment the members of this government adopted the very suggestion made by Mr. Bergeron and his friends in the province of Quebec, that moment they became entitled to be branded by *La Patrie* as criminal cowards. What keeps the Minister of Public Works in the same cabinet with the Prime Minister, and the other ministers whom, by inference, his newspaper has branded as criminal cowards. Sir, it would be unparliamentary to suggest the only reason which can keep these gentlemen holding such diverse opinions on a great national question in the same cabinet. But I have not done justice to *La Patrie*. On the same date it says:

What have we to do with the affairs of Africa? What interests have we in the Transvaal? Why should we take the money and the blood of the ratepayers of this country to squander them in these far-away regions?

Was that calculated, Sir, to strengthen the hands of this government in carrying out what was obviously intended by the resolutions that were passed by this House and placed upon its journals? The next day *La Patrie* follows this up by saying:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the other day, very clearly defined the government's position in stating that there was no justification whatever for the government offering or sending a contingent without previously consulting parliament. It, therefore, follows that the Canadian government did not offer any military contingent to the Imperial government.

For our own part, we have no hesitation whatever in stating that if the Laurier cabinet had taken upon itself the responsibility of exposing the future of Canada in sending a military contingent to the Transvaal at the expense of this country, we should have blamed its policy.

Therefore, the hon. gentleman, through his organ, threatened his colleagues in the government that they would be struck down by that powerful organ of public opinion, *La Patrie*, if they ventured to differ with him in opinion on this question.

The Canadian contingent leaving for the Transvaal is composed of men who have voluntarily offered their services. The Canadian government had neither the right nor the power to officially engage our country without consulting parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Now, Sir, I come to the hon. gentleman's own language, over his own signature, and what does he say?—though it did not require that, because every person knows that not a line can find its way into *La Patrie* on matters of public policy without the sanction and approval of the hon. gentleman. It would be extraordinary if it could be otherwise with that paper, which is declared to be the official organ of the government in the district of Montreal. In *La Patrie* of the 10th of October, the hon. gentleman says:

I am in a position to give you the most positive assurance that the government has not come to any decision relative to the sending of a military corps to the Transvaal. The merits of the dispute between England and the Transvaal are one thing, the interference by Canada in the foreign wars of the empire is another. It is sought to create precedent which would have for result the compulsory participation in the future by Canada in any and all the conflicts which may sweep over Europe and over the various parts of the world in which the large European governments are interested.

Everything to terrorize the public, everything to make it impossible for his colleagues to force his hand or differ from him on this important question. But the hon. gentleman was good enough to add:

The government will be happy to favour the departure of all those whose warlike instincts and patriotism make them want to go to the Transvaal to fight, but I do not believe that public opinion in this country asks more, and I will add will never consent to more in such an eventuality as now exists.

What is it that holds the hon. gentleman in association with these 'criminal cowards,' branded as such by him if they adopted such a policy? Whatever the inducement may be that keeps the hon. gentleman as a minister of the Crown, I say that if he had proper respect for himself or for his colleagues, such an association would be absolutely impossible. Either he held these opinions or he did not. If he did not, then he was endeavouring to deceive and delude and mislead the people of this country; if he did hold them, he should have had the courage of his opinions, and when it came to the question of resigning a position which no man in this country should occupy a single hour, when separated by such a gulf from the action his colleagues were determined to take, then the hon. gentleman if he respected either himself or his opinions or his associates, would have instantly severed that connection. Now, I am going to call a gentleman from the other side of the House and put his opinion in contradiction with that which I have just quoted. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), speaking in Montreal on his return from Chicago, where he had been with the Premier on the 12th of October, used the following language, which I am proud to place alongside of that which I