

because of the reverses which England has met with. I do not trouble myself as to whether the second Order in Council contains this restriction, 'this does not serve as a precedent.' This restriction is quite delusive.

As it proved.

I am a Canadian and my idea is to see Canada take rank amongst the independent nations as soon as she is sufficiently developed by the vitality, population and immensity of our national resources. In order, therefore, to reach this end we want all our revenues here to develop our resources and attract emigration, instead of sending our people as targets to South Africa.

Yet, we are all united,, we are of one voice and one sentiment on the whole of this question. I do not intend to tell hon. gentlemen what I think of the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville, but I will tell you what one of the most influential French papers says on this subject. I refer to *La Presse*, in the city of Montreal. That paper, referring to the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville, says :

There is neither equivocation nor restriction. Mr. Monet knows that the matter is one of urgency, and yet he is opposed to sending Canadian aid at a time when England needs it. This is disloyalty pure and simple.

This is not my charge against the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville, but it is the declaration of the most influential French paper in the whole province of Quebec, the most widely circulated paper and an independent paper, as my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says :

Here is a flag which defends our commerce upon every sea, yet Mr. Monet pretends that we should accept the protection without being obliged to render any assistance therefor. It matters little to him whether we are to belong to a power of the first rank or to one of the second. He sees no difference between a nation of the first, second or third order. He desires the prosperity of Canada, but he expects to effect it in this way.

It is by such outbursts as this that we, a minority in the Canadian Dominion, make ourselves ridiculous in the eyes of the other provinces.

There is another of the right hon. gentleman's supporters driven away from his side, taken away from giving the support he would have loyally given by the fact of the government of Canada being undermined by a man within their own ranks and in their own counsels, who is using his press, his influence and his power among the people of Canada to break down and destroy the confidence of the vast body of the people of this country in this action. It is madness to shut our eyes to the facts as they are and to believe the statement, which is not founded in fact, that the entire population of this country is sustaining this action of the government of Canada in regard to the Transvaal. In order to deal with a question of this kind you must adopt

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

the course of a surgeon dealing with a disease. If a cancer makes its appearance in the most remote extremity you will have to cut it off or you will have death resulting through the whole body becoming permeated. So, I say with this moral cancer existing in the heart of the government, you have no alternative but to cut off that cancer, to separate and dissever it from the body politic of Canada or it will result in the political death of the body that does not adopt such heroic means of treatment as those which are adopted by surgical operation. I am happy to say that nothing is so distasteful to me as to be compelled, by a sense of duty, to animadvert upon the conduct of any gentleman in this House or out of it. I want to turn to a subject of a much more agreeable character and to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that he, himself, personally, stood pledged and committed on this great question. When the right hon. gentleman was sitting alongside of the Prince of Wales, at the Imperial Institute, on the 18th of June, he made a very memorable, and, as usual, a most eloquent and most admirable speech, and I am very happy to say that, so far as I am able to judge, I take very little exception to a single word that the right hon. gentleman said. I want to draw his attention just now to what he did say on that memorable occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of the Empire, when British subjects from all over the empire were surrounding Her Majesty and vieing with each other in their devotion to the Crown and British institutions. He said :

My answer is this simply : Canada is a nation; Canada is free, and freedom is its nationality. Although Canada acknowledges the suzerainty of a sovereign power, I am here to say that independence can give us no more rights than we have at the present day.

I agree with the right hon. gentleman most fully and heartily in that statement, and a most important statement it is.

Lord Lansdowne has spoken of a day when, perhaps, our empire might be in danger—

A very curious coincidence that that suggestion should come at such a time from a gentleman who is now burdened with Imperial duties as Secretary of State for War.

England has proved at all times that she can fight her own battles, but if a day were ever to come when England was in danger, let the bugle sound, let the fire be lit on the hills, and in all parts of the colonies, though we might not be able to do much, whatever we can do shall be done by the colonies to help her.

That requires no comment; it speaks for itself; it is a volume in a word. It covers the entire case and I congratulate the right hon. gentleman upon having had his usually felicitous mood of dealing with important questions. Let me call attention to a speech