

may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops, to be used to fight for Canada's defence. . . . There is no menace to Canada, and although we may be willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so. Then, again, how could we do so without parliament granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words, we should have to summon parliament.'

He quotes the language of the right hon. gentleman and proves out of his own mouth that he had violated the constitution, and refuses to serve any longer under a Prime Minister that so trampled upon the constitution of the country. Then he goes back to his constituents, because he cannot come here as a supporter of the right hon. gentleman, and secures a re-election. Then what do we see? The right hon. gentleman puts in the mouth of the Governor General of Canada the statement that there is entire unanimity of opinion among the whole people of Canada—no words in the English language could be stronger, and this in face of the fact that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) secured a unanimous verdict of approval from the people of his county after he had thus denounced the action of this government in sending military aid to the British government in the Transvaal. And yet, Sir, it is sought to delude the people of this country into the belief that there is no difference of opinion. Then what took place? Then we find in the press the malign influence of the Minister of Public Works, disseminating hostility to the government of which he was a member. How he can remain a member of the government under these circumstances I leave it to the members of the government to settle among themselves. The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

The question is to decide whether the Canadian people shall be called upon to take part in all the wars of the empire without the doors of the Imperial parliament and cabinet board opened to them, without even being consulted through their representatives and the government on the advisability of those bloody contests. I shall never consent to uphold such a retrogressive policy.

Is the member for the county of Labelle nobody? Are his constituents nobodies? It would seem so, in face of that declaration that he has gone to them and asked them to denounce the government for its action in sending aid to Her Majesty's government, and has procured from them an unanimous verdict of approval. Yet in the face of this fact, this House is asked to say that there has been absolute unanimity upon this important question on the part of the whole Canadian people, without any exception whatever.

Now, Sir, commenting upon the resignation of the hon. member for Labelle, *La Patrie*, on the 22nd of October, says:

We state in the most emphatic manner that the departure of the volunteers, under the present conditions, is not and will not be a precedent.

How long was it not to be a precedent, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me what he meant when his paper said that it was not to be a precedent, whether it was not to be a precedent for a fortnight, or for three weeks, or for a month.

The violent discussions which take place, the sensational resignation of Mr. Bourassa—

Mark this, Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the First Minister to this statement, that instead of there being a unanimity on this question, there are violent discussions going on in his own province, among the people of the province of Quebec.

The violent discussions which take place, the sensational resignation of Mr. Bourassa, place on the order of the day the question of our future relations with the Empire. No taxes without representation, which is the political gospel of British citizens the world over, cannot be ignored here any more than elsewhere.

These are valiant words inspired by the hon. Minister of Public Works, but he was far from giving them effect when it came to the question of whether he should stay in or go out. What more? It is not only the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), but take the case of the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Monet). These are the gentlemen who stand shoulder to shoulder, who stand in a united phalanx, sustaining this government! They are all broken up amongst themselves, giving out, over their own signatures as the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville did, statements denouncing the action of this government and declaring, in the face of the world, that they never would come out in support of doing such violence to the constitution of the country. On December 30 that hon. gentleman said:

The federal cabinet, without consulting parliament, has just decided to send a second Canadian contingent to South Africa. It is not a question, like the first case, of a simple act of courtesy towards Great Britain. We espouse her quarrels and we make our own a war which Hon. Edward Blake has qualified as unjust and as oppressive. It is no longer a feeble pecuniary contribution that is asked. It is our contribution of blood which is demanded, and that in a war which threatens to be the most bloody of the century. Why should we contribute? Canada has nothing to do with the causes that provoked this war, and not being represented in the parliament which brought it about, I ask for what reason I should be called upon to contribute anything whatever. It has been said that the first contingent was sent to Africa as an act of politeness to England, which was not supposed to be in want of men, the Order in Council declaring that it was not to be a precedent. The second contingent is being sent