

fight for his country, and who falls with his face to the foe in defence of the flag, when, Sir, the cable flashes back to that mother's heart the news that her son has died, that poor mother would not laugh and revile, and ridicule. She would thank for many a day the kind and beneficent donor whose act enabled \$1,000 to be placed to the credit of her lost breadwinner. A fine sneer curled the lip of the Minister of Agriculture when my hon. friend began to speak about that insurance. My hon. friend does not need it; but there are many poor families in this country, who, before this cruel war is over, will have reason again and again to thank the kind and benevolent spirit that made that munificent provision for times of darkness and distress.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Public Works gives a wonderfully naive and imposing turn to his sentences. After having read that miserable and unfounded accusation, he, a Minister of the Crown, turned around to his French confreres, and said:

I hope that in the presence of provocations like these, you will understand your duties, whatever your political opinions may have been in the past.

That is high politics from a gentleman who accuses others. What kind of politics ought that to be called? The hon. gentleman makes a statement that he has never proved, that he cannot prove, an audacious statement, and then he turns to his confiding French friends and says: 'There you have it: they are trying to kill a Frenchman. Now, you vote against them, for their purposes are deadly and fell to high politics for a Liberal government. He says:

I am come to ask you if Sir Charles Tupper and those about him taunt us with being an inferior race—

Will my hon. friend make a note of that, and give us the page, the time and the place where Sir Charles Tupper made any statement like that, taunting the French people with being an inferior race?

—when they declare they wish to give the minority power by force of arms, if it is not time to say to Sir Charles Tupper, 'Stop there, you are going too far.'

Now, will my hon. friend, a cabinet minister, sworn as a privy-councillor, make the least approach to the proof that Sir Charles Tupper or any person accredited by Sir Charles Tupper ever made a statement of that kind?

Sir Charles Tupper goes about crying and making his followers cry everywhere that the French Canadians are disloyal men.

That is said by a minister of the Crown; that is said by the government; they take the responsibility of it. My hon. friend is to speak: let him name the time and the place where Sir Charles Tupper or any

Mr. FOSTER.

other Conservative leader ever stated that the French people were a disloyal race. *La Presse* declared that my hon. friend's supporter was a disloyal man, both of them French Canadians, because of the statement of something that the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Monet) said:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Over his own name.

Mr. FOSTER. Over his own name. The assertion that a leader of a great party and his colleagues go about in a country which has two millions of French Canadian citizens, with whom we live and do business, declaring that they are a disloyal race, is contrary to reason and is absolutely untrue.

It has been sought to make this a race question—why? Because Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the Prime Minister of this country, and because my name is Tarte.

Mr. BENNETT. His name will be Dennis.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has sought to make it a race question because Sir Wilfrid is the Prime Minister and a Frenchman, or because the Minister of Public Works has the euphonious name of Tarte. He says:

If Sir Wilfrid, instead of being French, had been English, we would have heard nothing of all that.

There is a statement which any man can test by his own common sense. Let me put it to you. If the unthinkable thought could be thought that the Hon. William Mulock was Prime Minister of this country—and perhaps it will not, in the long future be an unthinkable thought—and he acted in the same delaying, hesitating, inconsistent way as the Prime Minister did—does any one doubt that Liberal-Conservatives would have been on his track just exactly as they were on that of the Prime Minister. There is an absolutely fair way of thinking out this matter, each man for himself, and every man knows that the criticism is not against the race of the one who happens to be in power, but against his action or lack of action in this case. Then in this wise the hon. gentleman winds up by saying:

I regret that he (Sir Charles Tupper) is devoting the last years of his life, of a career which is nearly terminated, to arousing in this country racial and religious animosity.

But in Sherbrooke the right hon. gentleman made the statement that Sir Charles Tupper is saying that I did not move because I am French, and in Quebec his followers are saying that I go too far because I have English sympathies.

I challenge my right hon. friend to prove by one quotation, by one single bit of evidence, the statement he then made in order to gain votes, that Sir Charles Tupper was