

destined—no, I will not say destined, because it failed of its object—but which was intended to reconcile the growing dissension between the two branches of the Union. Daniel Webster supported that legislation, and for having taken that action he was censured by some of the abolitionists of the Northern States. Among those abolitionists I must say there were some men of the highest character, such as Theodore Parker, Horace Mann and James Russell Lowell. The issue showed that even the brightest intellects could be clouded by passion, and that some well-intentioned men never can realize that any stand on a public question

different from their own can be 5 p.m. as noble as their own, and that there are men who will never forgive those whose intellects plunge deeper into the horizon than their own. It was the good fortune of Daniel Webster to live long enough to see many of them recant their opinions, and, as I said a moment ago, the judgment of history has not confirmed the strictures upon Daniel Webster adverted to by my hon. friend. And, if my hon. friend will take the last and the best of all, he will find that the speech which was delivered by Webster, though criticised in parts, is declared by Cecil Rhodes himself to have shown statesmanship of the highest order. There is more. The whole matter has been well summed up by one of the greatest minds in the last generation. James G. Blaine, in his work entitled 'Twenty years of Congress,' says:

The thoughtful reconsideration of his severest critics must allow that Mr. Webster saw before him a divided duty, and that he chose the part which in his patriotic judgment was demanded by the supreme danger of the hour.

I commend these words to my hon. friend. The patriotic judgment of Sir George Ross showed what was the supreme danger of the hour, and it was because he saw the supreme danger of the hour that he acted as he did. Sir George Ross is well known as an intense imperialist, but upon that occasion there was a question which was uppermost: It was a question of the autonomy of this country, and by that principle he stood. My hon. friend will allow, now that the matter has passed, for the present at all events, that the Bill which was brought in last session, was not even a measure of emergency, although it was so called. It was simply a measure of expediency involving a policy of contribution, a policy which had been denounced by the very men themselves who introduced the

Bill, a policy which was not justified by anything which then existed. They introduced it upon the shallow pretense of emergency. Emergency? Who speaks to-day of emergency? Twelve months have passed since my right hon. friend the Prime Minister introduced his measure. Twelve months and more have passed since that time when he saw the German peril. He saw Germany almost ready to jump at the throat of Great Britain. He saw clouds on the horizon; he saw these clouds rent by lightning; he heard the murmurs and rumbling of distant thunder. But my right hon. friend to-day may live in peace: The atmosphere is pure, the sky is clear. My right hon. friend, I think, heard the words of the Lord Chancellor, which were pronounced in this country last year, to the effect that the relations between Germany and Great Britain, were cordial and he must have read with the greatest satisfaction that not later than five weeks ago a cause of difficulty between the two nations about some territory in Africa had been amicably settled. And from that time to this moment the relations between the two countries which were cordial in the month of September last have been absolutely friendly. The light has been let in on that question, and we know now how much the country and the empire and the civilized world has been deceived upon that question of so-called emergency. We know now, we have the evidence, how the panics of which we have heard in this House more than once, are created and engineered. We have had the evidence that these panics are engineered by the armour-plate builders and by the great ship-building firms who do not hesitate to create false news in order to obtain contracts for their ships. The matter was brought up in the German Reichstag, and the following letter addressed by the firm to one of its agents in Paris was read:

We have just wired to you asking you to await in Paris our to-day's letter. The reason for the telegram was that we should like to obtain the insertion in one of the most widely-read French journals—preferably the 'Figaro'—an article to the effect that the French military authorities have decided to accelerate considerably the re-arming of the troops with new machine guns, and to order double the quantity of the latter as against their original intention. We shall be much obliged if you could succeed in getting such an article published.

That letter was signed by two directors of what was supposed to be a respectable firm. The thing was denounced in the German Reichstag, and it could not rest