

that the right hon. leader of the government is disloyal. I do not believe that members of the government party are disloyal. Since I have been here I have not heard one sentiment of disloyalty pronounced by any hon. gentleman or seen any such sentiment given effect to. I know that the members of the government party are loyal, and I know that every member of the opposition is loyal. I believe that we have in the right hon. leader of the government as loyal a man as we ever had in Canada, and a great statesman. I believe that we have in the hon. leader of the opposition a gentleman of the highest integrity and character, and a loyal man. Therefore, I say that it is beneath the dignity of any member of this House to give utterance to sentiments impugning the loyalty of any gentleman here present. I am loyal; I am a grandson of a loyalist. I may say further that I am an imperialist. I say that, because I have heard a number of members declare that they were not imperialists. It has also been asserted here—what I never thought would be said in parliament—that the right honourable leader of the government was against sending men to South Africa. Unless the government at that time had responded to public sentiment, and sent men to South Africa, so far as I am concerned, and so far, I believe, as every man in the maritime provinces is concerned, they would not have had one supporter. But I cannot find that there was any holding back on the part of the right hon. leader of the government in that matter. I find that the right hon. gentleman left on the 7th of October for Chicago and returned on the 12th. I find that the Boer ultimatum was issued on the 9th of October, that it was rejected on the 10th, and that war was declared on the 11th. I find that Sir Wilfrid on the 12th of October declared that he would send a contingent to South Africa even if his government were defeated in consequence thereof. Then I find that on the 13th of October, an order in council was passed to send a contingent; and it reflects great credit on the Militia Department that within such a very short time the contingent was recruited, equipped and sent. At that time no regular regiment, supposed to be ready for service, was able to get ready and sail any more quickly than the contingent we raised, equipped, armed and put on ship-board. But our hon. friends of the opposition, who have given expression to such ultra-loyal feelings, cannot have forgotten what was stated by Mr. Bourassa, in a debate in this House in 1906. Mr. Bourassa, who is now, one might say, the Moses of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, stated this on page 98 of 'Hansard' of that year:

Mr. H. H. McLEAN.

My attitude regarding the South African war was that observed by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1885, when he refused to the British authorities the right to enroll men in Canada for the British army in the Soudan.

Let hon. gentlemen of the opposition take that to their hearts and what do they think of it? What a howl they would have made if that action had been taken by any man on the Liberal side! While they sat under it quietly and without a protest at that time, I am satisfied that the gentlemen who compose the opposition in this House to-day would not support a policy of that kind. Any member of the opposition who would declare such a policy to-day would be almost driven out of the party. I am sure that any man on the government side would be. But I will go on and read further what Mr. Bourassa said:

My attitude on that question was the same that Sir Charles Tupper took in 1893 when he said in Winnipeg that the idea of basing a closer union between Great Britain and her colonies upon the principle of unity in defence of the empire, was a false one, that Canada had done all she could do, all that she ought to be forced to do for imperial defence, when she fortified her own territory and developed her own resources by building railways in the Northwest and giving communication to British troops between England and Asia.

Mr. MEIGHEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he takes the responsibility of the correctness of Mr. Bourassa's statements?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. There is no doubt that the statements made there are correct. If they were not correct, why did not some of the gentlemen on the opposition side at that time get up and deny them? The statements were made on the floor of the House and were put in 'Hansard,' and have never been denied. I have made inquiries, and I find that these statements are absolutely correct. I defy any hon. gentleman of the opposition to say that the statement made by Mr. Bourassa as regards the action of Sir John Macdonald in 1885 was not correct.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Bourassa was then the Moses of the great Liberal party, was he not?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. He was not loyal enough for us, so we gave him to you. He was not loyal enough for us, because he was against our sending troops to South Africa, and so we handed him over to your party. But I do ask, why refer to irrelevant matters of that kind? Every one knows that Sir John Macdonald was a loyal man, that Sir Charles Tupper is a loyal man, an ultra-loyal man. Can there be any doubt that the right hon. the leader