

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/  
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/  
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/  
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/  
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

There are some creases in the middle of the pages.  
Il y a des plis dans le milieu des pages.

- Additional comments:  
Commentaires supplémentaires

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
							✓				

# House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

SPEECH

OF

HENRI BOURASSA M.P.

ON

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR CANADIAN INTERVENTION, &c.

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 1901

### SUPPLY—S. A. WAR—CANADIAN INTERVENTION, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Since I have given notice of the motion which I am now to propose, a double accusation has been brought against me.

On one hand, I am pointed out to the eyes of my English-speaking fellow-citizens as a French demagogue; and, on the other, I am denounced to my own countrymen as a dangerous British Imperialist.

Of course, having made up my mind to say what I think, as I think it, on all matters of national importance, I will not bother myself with the opinion of this paper or that one: it would be easier to get a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than to bring a political sheet to appreciate an idea with complete independence and good faith.

In the course of my remarks, I will have occasion to deal with the charge of French demagoguery, to which, I must say, I never

attached any importance. The intention of raising a racial agitation on this matter has always been so foreign to my mind and so totally absent from my utterances, that I never took the trouble to confute that accusation. I thought I could rely on the common sense and straightforwardness of English Canadians to do justice on that slander.

As to my imperialistic tendencies, they should not call for much argument either. Nevertheless, the problem has received so little serious consideration, from the Quebec representatives especially, that some explanation may be required. The preamble of my motion sets out my intention clearly enough, I think. I do not recede for one moment from the position which I have taken and kept from the day the Canadian government decided to take part in the South African war; that position being identical to that occupied by the cabinet till the 13th October, 1899.

This proposition therefore does not imply an admission on my part that the government had a right and a duty to interfere in

South Africa. I shall never admit that the country could be thrown in any war by order in council. I shall never acknowledge that the government was excusable, for the sake of power or popularity; or even in order to avoid the nightmare of racial agitation, to open, by a mere cabinet decision, a new era in our relations with Great Britain, without at least enlightening the people upon the real consequences of their action. I still assert that Canada is not bound and should not be called to any other military action than the defence of her territory.

Such principles being reserved, there is no necessity for my insisting any more upon them at present. The point I want to make is this: We, Canadians, have been taxed, some wilfully and some forcibly, to defray the cost of this expedition; we have, therefore, the right to pronounce on the outcome and the settlement of the conflict in which we have been made a party, and we should not allow the British government to presume and decide arbitrarily of our opinion without even consulting us on the matter. As I have stated when I moved my anti-Imperialist resolution last year; as I repeated the other day in support of the motion of the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) requesting the abolition of the anti-Catholic declaration forced upon the King on the day of his coronation: I believe it is our right and duty, as representatives of a self-governing British community, to express an opinion and to make suggestions on any matter of vital interest to British power—provided always we impair in no way our full liberty and complete self-control of action.

Strange to say, no traces of Imperialism were pointed out in the help given by Canada to soldiers wounded in the Crimean war; nor in the part played by Sir John A. Macdonald in the settlement of the Alabama claim at the expense of Canada; nor in the three resolutions in favour of home rule for Ireland discussed in this parliament; nor even in the motion of sympathy with the gold miners and speculators of the Transvaal adopted by this House at the request of Mr. Rhodes's agent. But now, Imperialism is declared to be the basis of a proposition asking that a conflict in which we have taken an active part should be settled upon the same principles that have made Canada happy and prosperous and which this parliament wanted, some years ago, to be applied to Ireland. Stranger still, I am told that Canada has not the right to say that an end should be put to a war in which her required contribution of 500 men has been raised to over 3,000, and her national expenditure of a few thousand dollars to more than two millions. And finally when British authorities are unable to find police recruits in the United Kingdom, in New Zealand and in Australia, when the Cape Colonists themselves, for the benefit of whom that force is organized, refuse

to enlist—I am denied by Imperialists and by anti-Imperialists as well the right to say that Sir Alured Milner and Mr. Chamberlain should not have been allowed and helped to play any longer upon the candid and enthusiastic naivety of Canadians.

The principles upon which I have based this proposition are not new; they were born with the British nation itself; they were brought by the Saxon pirates from the dark forests of Teutonia to the Celtic island of the north; they were laid down as the corner-stone of the British constitution by a section of that robust Norman race of which the French Canadians are to-day, perhaps, the most direct and thorough offsprings. Many a blow was struck at them; they were reddened by the blood of powerful assailants and of heroic defenders; I hope they will stand the present craze as they stood the attacks of monarchs and mobs, of oligarchists and aristocrats. I mean the right, for all British subjects, of petition and remonstrance to the Crown, and the right of directing the use that shall be made of their money.

The new Imperialism is the very antithesis of these rights. The tendency of Mr. Chamberlain's ideas, favoured, either wilfully or blindly, by most colonial public men, is to centralize gradually the political, military and economical ruling of the empire, making it as free as possible from independent local action. In order to set asleep the susceptibilities of the Canadian or of the Australian, and to kill their colonial vanity by swelling their jingoistic pride, it is whispered that the capital of the new empire may not stay where it is. But that does not matter: whether worshipped at London or at Toronto, at Melbourne or at Calcutta, the Buddha of the Imperialists will remain the same omnipotent fetic, and the choir of the faithful shall have to howl the same hymn. One of the most remarkable features of the new Britishism is that the more he swells in ambition the less tolerant he grows towards differing convictions.

It has been said, printed and sung on all tures for over a year, that this war has raised the past subservient state of British self-governing colonies to the rank of free nations allied with Great Britain. Eloquent periods have been thrown to the four winds, celebrating the proud position which we occupy now in the British Empire.

Those triumphant effusions of colonial pride recall forcibly to my mind the decadent years of the Roman empire, when poets and rhetors, forgetful of the rude but free life of their forefathers, were extolling the glories of Cæsar and worshipping his golden image, because they were allowed to share in his refined debaucheries; because the old warriors of Gaul and Brittany, of Iberia and Germania had become the best legionaries of the empire, and could help in conquering more lands, in looting more herds, in burn-

ing more farms, in ravishing more women and starving more children for the everlasting glory of 'Cæsar, Imperator et deus'. Rome held a vaster empire, her provinces were better subdued, she boasted more of her power on the eve of her downfall than at any other period of her history. But we know now, and her clear-sighted citizens knew then, that the time of her greatest moral and material strength was when her statesmen thought more of curing evils at home and of keeping the old Roman spirit of liberty, than of plundering the world and worshipping brutal force and insatiable greed in the person of the Emperor.

But I do not want to add fuel to the fire of jingo feelings. I will simply remind the members of the House, those especially who are most proud of the position we occupy in the empire, that, if we do not want Canada to be considered by the British government as a mere colonial field for profitable speculation, it is most urgent that we should make ourselves respected not only on the battlefield, but also in His Majesty's councils. The time has come when we should tell Mr. Chamberlain that, having had at leisure and unreservedly the blood of our blood and the flesh of our flesh, the tears of Canadian mothers and the sweat of Canadian farmers and workers, in order to enrich himself and his brother and his son, and the whole of his tribe, by selling guns and ammunition, he should at least respect the language of the Canadian people, and not distort as he pleases the documents which are sent to him by the Canadian government.

I exposed before the House, at the last session, the strange course followed by the Colonial Secretary; his using our Transvaal resolution of 1899 to say that we were in favour of his provoking and arrogant policy; his acceptance of our offers of help before they had ever been tendered; the publication by the London papers of his official despatch to Lord Minto before it had reached our government; and above all, his insolent reply to the order in council of October 13th. Since then, we have had another manifestation of the growing audacity of the master of the empire. Last year, on the 4th of June, I put the following question to the government:

Has the government, or any of its members, been consulted as to the conditions upon which the South African war should be settled? Is it the intention of the government to offer any suggestion or opinion on the matter?

To which the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) replied:

Neither the government, nor any of its members, have been consulted as to conditions upon which the South African war should be settled. They are not considering the advisability of offering any suggestion or opinion upon the matter.

And the reply was noisily applauded by the

opposition. This session, on the 18th of February, I put the following question:

1. Was the Canadian government, or any of its members, consulted by the British government on the South African question since the 1st of June last?

2. Did the Canadian government, or any of its members, offer any opinion or make any suggestion to the British government on the matter?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Canadian government was not consulted, nor any of its members, by the British government on the South African question since June 1st last. No member of the Canadian government offered any opinion on the matter.

Let us now cross the ocean, enter Westminster Palace, the mother of parliaments, the source and safeguard of British liberty, of British justice, of British truth. On the 7th day of August last—I read from the Times' parliamentary report:

Mr. Faber (York) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, considering the part taken by Canada and Australia in the South African war, it was proposed to ascertain the views of the government of those countries in regard to the settlement and government of the Transvaal and Orange State when the war was over.

And remembering the declarations made by the Prime Minister of Canada on the 4th of June, 1900, and on the 18th of February, 1901, let us hear the reply of the oracle of the new British world:

Mr. Chamberlain.—I have already made myself acquainted with the views of the colonies of Canada and Australia in regard to the main points of the future settlement, and Her Majesty's government are in complete accordance with them as to the necessity for annexation, the establishment of a government supported by military force, with the ultimate expectation of an extension to both colonies of representative self-government. (Cheers.)

Yes, cheers on both sides of the Atlantic, —but which is which?

One would be tempted to qualify such a flagrant contradiction in terms that would call for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. But, after all, this was not much worse than when being told officially that the Canadian government were permitting the enlistment of the first contingent because they considered that the colony was not committed to any future action, the Colonial Secretary replied officially that the British government were accepting our troops as an evidence of our willingness 'to share in the risks and burdens of the empire,' and as a proof of our sympathy with his policy in South Africa. That first distortion having been tacitly accepted here, the Colonial Secretary was only encouraged in his methods. But I think it justifies me in appealing to the members of this House in the name of Canadian self-respect to put a stop to that arbitrary treatment. I appeal to those at least who have not reached that point of devotion to Mr. Chamberlain that to be made tools of in his

hands is to be considered a great honour to Canada.

In that new alliance with Great Britain which has changed our state of humble servility into a glorious matrimony, I would like to know how long we are called to play the part of a deceived but contented husband. In national intercourse, as well as in private life that role is not yet considered as one to be much boasted about—by the husband at least.

I do not see that I have to apologize for anything I said in the past on this question. My course has been twice endorsed and emphatically approved by my constituents. It has been said that the almost unanimous voice of the people of Canada approved of our intervention in South Africa, and therefore, that we, the few members of this House who condemned that intervention, must be in the wrong. I deny this proposition in toto. It is false both in principle and in fact. First, number does not make right what is wrong. Majority rules, but not always in truth and equity. I am an optimist. I firmly believe that, on the whole, good is prevalent and that right conquers might at the end. But there are periods of moral depression when thousands and millions of men, when entire nations seem to lose the path of justice and even the sense of self conservation. If it is but an accidental attack of fever, a reaction follows which restores health and common sense in the body politic. If it is the last illness, the nation disappears and a new one takes its place under the sun. And the world goes on under the guidance of God. Fortunately for Canada, signs of reaction are already noticeable; and I can foresee the day when the judgment of the people of Canada, English as well as French, will not be so hard on me as the speeches, the votes, the songs and the howlings which illustrated the debates of last session. That reaction is not yet of such a character to warrant the confidence of my Quebec Liberal friends who naively believe that Imperialism is a fake or a dead issue. But the change is strong enough to give hopes to those who dread for our rising nation the brutalizing effect of soldiery rule, the development of the spirit of conquest and plunder, and the heavy burdens of Imperial militarism. Even in England the reaction is manifest. In fact the wave of jingoism never reached there the point it attained here. As usual, the true colonial jingo outdid the loudest London cockney. Before going to the polls, Mr. Chamberlain the master of the British administration, made of his war the main, nay the sole issue of the electoral contest: 'A vote against the government is a vote for the Boers,' said he in his peculiar Bismarckian way. And in reply to this passionate appeal, and in spite of the disorganization of the Liberal party, 1,603,537 suffrages were given for the Boers—to use the Colonial

Secretary's own stamping—in 427 divisions, and eighty ridings returned oppositionists by acclamation. And every one admits that the vote would be far more favourable to the Liberals now than last fall. The change effected in the editorship of the Daily News is quite an indication of the change of sentiment. We may see before long a repetition of the anti-war feeling which followed the deplorable Crimean expedition. Now take the result of the London county council elections just held last week. The Moderates, despairing to get a majority on straight municipal issues, dragged the khaki cry in the contest. 'Do you want a pro-Boer council?' was their war cry; and what was the reply? An increased majority for the Progressists.

As far as Canada is concerned, the verdict of the electorate has been interpreted by the people of Great Britain and of the empire at large with such an ignorance of the real issue that it is most proper to make a short analysis of the situation. In order to give to the House an idea of the way British opinion was misguided on Canadian feelings, by the leading Tory organs, I will just quote a few lines from the London Times. In a letter from its special correspondent in Toronto, dated September 24, and published on the 6th October, the political situation in Canada and its bearing on Imperial affairs is very ably considered. After saying that the French Canadians are more thoroughly Canadian than all others, and consequently less interested in British and Imperial concerns, the writer adds these words, which I commend to the attention of the House:

It was a singularly fortunate circumstance that at this critical time in national affairs a French Canadian statesman was at the head of the Dominion government. Without his leadership, Quebec might have caused trouble. A French member of the cabinet and more than one private member of parliament objected to the conditions on which the Canadian contingents were sent to the front.

Then speaking of the hesitations of the Prime Minister in sending the troops:

No doubt he (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) felt that his compatriots required to be educated by degrees to the full demands of British citizenship.

I would like to hear from the right hon. gentleman on what lines and how far he is prepared to carry on that course of education. After the elections, the great English Tory organ thought it was good policy to interpret the Liberal majority as a victory for Imperialism. In an editorial dated November 10th, it said:

Both parties in Canada are Imperialist; and we believe that the Conservatives, if they had been in power, would have pursued, in this respect, the same course that was pursued by the Liberals. Nevertheless, it fell to the Liberals, as a matter of fact, to do the work, and it was done with a promptitude, a gracefulness, and a liberality which could not have been surpassed,

and which Great Britain will never forget. As far as obtaining popularity in this country was concerned, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his cabinet had a magnificent opportunity and they employed it to the full. That they should do so was the more gratifying when we consider that the backbone of their strength is derived from the French population of the Dominion and especially from Quebec which from circumstances which we, perhaps, do not fully understand, was less strongly represented in South Africa than some other provinces.

I think this is rather hard on hon. gentlemen opposite who are mostly stout Imperialists but whose Imperialism would have no doubt been greatly strengthened by access to power, even at the hands of French dominators. But the most peculiar appreciation by the Times of the electoral result in Canada appeared in its Toronto letter, dated November 10, and published on the 24th. I quote the following words:

On one point of national importance the election has cleared the air. It is now manifest that Sir Wilfrid Laurier has not been injured among his French Canadian followers by his British Imperialism. So far as Quebec is concerned, the sending of the Canadian contingents to South Africa was fully ratified by the vote of last Wednesday. The Premier had never shrunk the responsibility which he assumed in the matter, and the issue was fairly before the French electors. So far as Imperial politics are concerned, therefore, the decisive attitude of Quebec is satisfactory.

The conclusions of the two last quoted articles are utterly false, and the intelligence of Canadian affairs displayed in the former is an evidence of the wilful bad faith of the two others.

The question of Imperialism was put neither squarely nor fairly before the people of Canada. In the English-speaking provinces, it was kept on the ground of sentiment where it had been placed in this House, each party claiming the first prize in their competitive devotion to the mother land; but the constitutional aspect and the ultimate consequences of our military expedition were not discussed.

In the province of Quebec, when the issue was raised, both parties were simply charging each other with being the cause of that display of jingoism which had forced the hands of the government. What was claimed in one part of the land as an act of virtue, was denounced in the other part as a crime. I may tell, in passing, to all those who are sincerely seeking for peace and harmony between the two races who compose the Canadian nation, that they vainly endeavour to reach that happy result so long as they keep up that double-faced system of treating great national problems. I will come back to this point later on.

Let me now place before the House a few facts which prove that the sentiment of the English-speaking people was not so decidedly one-sided as it has been stated in this House and throughout the country. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Put-

tee) was quoted as having said at a public meeting shortly after last session:

I voted for the expenditure of \$2,000,000 in South Africa, although I admit the justice of the position taken by Mr. Bourassa, and believe there is nothing in the constitution to warrant such expenditure. I simply voiced the wishes of my constituents in this matter.

On the eve of polling day he was bitterly denounced in the organ of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). The above words appeared on nearly every page of the Winnipeg Tribune in heavy type with headings and comments like these:

No Contingents for Him.  
Puttee Stands with Bourassa.  
Voted Against his Convictions.  
Too British for Him.

If Mr. Puttee had had his way, there would have been no contingents sent to South Africa in defence of the empire. His sympathies were with Mr. Bourassa.

Winnipeggers want a representative at Ottawa who is a Britisher at heart and who will stand by the empire on principle.

These are ultra-loyal appeals.

Mr. PUTTEE. The paper that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) has quoted was incorrect on that occasion and admittedly so.

Mr. BOURASSA. I was just coming to that point. I do not say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) used these words, but I simply say, that, on the eve of the polling day, if the passions of the people had been aroused to the point that was stated, if there had been such a current of public opinion, a man simply supposed to be what is called a pro-Boer, and supposed to have said that the government should have hesitated a little before committing this country, would have been swamped by his opponent. What was the result? The hon. gentleman was elected by a majority of 1,183, while, ten months previous, when he had the strength of two governments behind him, he was elected by 8.

In the east riding of Lambton the member-elect (Mr. Simmons) was denounced by the local Liberal organ, the Petrolia Topic, as a pro-Boer. True, the hon. gentleman denied the accusation; but the paper kept it up and, in reply to the hon. gentleman's denial, published half a dozen interviews with residents of the town affirming that, in several instances, the hon. gentleman had not disguised his disapproval of the position taken by the British government on South African matters. I do not pretend that the statement was founded; but nobody will deny that, had the war feeling been overwhelming in that riding, such accusations would have proved hard against the Conservative candidate. And here he is, returned by the majority of the people in a constituency which was represented last session by his opponent, a worthy and honourable citizen no doubt popular in his riding.

But here is a case still clearer. Dr. Weldon, who represented the riding of Albert, N.B., in this House from 1891 to 1896, is a distinguished professor of international law in the loyal city of Halifax. His disapproval of British policy in South Africa was widely known. He went as far as dedicating one of his lectures to the interpretation of the conventions signed between Great Britain and the South African republic; and his conclusion was a thorough condemnation of Mr. Chamberlain's attitude. I was told that he even dissuaded his son from starting for South Africa and taking part in a war which he considered unjust. This did not prevent that honourable and distinguished gentleman from being chosen as the Conservative candidate in the county of Albert and from being accepted as such by the very men who nearly fell into fits of apoplexy in this House when I gave expression to similar sentiments. True, Dr. Weldon was defeated; but in a contest where the Liberals have made tremendous gains in that province, he reduced his minority of 243 in 1896 to 116 in 1900.

These are the only three cases where it may be said that there was a slight indication in the English-speaking provinces, of what Jingo prophets call pro-Boer feelings on the part of candidates. And I do not think the results show that to differ on this question with Mr. Chamberlain and even with the leaders of both parties in Canada has been considered a national felony.

Other indications of reaction against military jingoism have been manifested in our English provinces since the election. On a previous occasion, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) spoke of the enthusiastic reception tendered in Halifax to volunteers returning from South Africa. I know Halifax to be very sentimental. Even its dry fish and hardware dealers cannot refrain their poetical ardour and introduce patriotic rhymes—not home-made, I must say—in their board of trade reports. But elsewhere, the enthusiasm was not quite so pronounced. Commenting on the arrival of our boys in the metropolis of Canada, the Montreal Gazette of December 25th last, said very philosophically:

The second detachment of the Canadian infantry received only a moderately warm welcome on its return from South Africa. The country is getting used to heroes, it would seem. It does not esteem them less, but it is less demonstrative of its feelings.

Of course this was in disloyal Quebec. But let us cross the Ottawa river and penetrate to the heart of the good old sister province, the bulwark of loyalism. Woodstock is an Ontario town, and if I am not mistaken, not largely peopled with pea-soup eaters—unless my hon. friend from North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) has educated his constituents to the taste of that healthy food. Here is a description of the quiet way in which returned soldiers were receiv-

ed in Woodstock, according to the Sentinel-Review of December 26th last:

When the train moved in yesterday morning about one person in twenty cheered; a minute after the men had alighted and before the band recommenced playing, there could hardly have been greater quietness at a funeral ceremony. Have we forgotten how to cheer?

I could contrast that funeral reception with the warm welcome which greeted Major Fiset on his return in the French town of Rimouski. I would suggest to the hon. member for North Oxford (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to get our colleague from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to deliver there some essays on Krügerism and Huttonism. And if these stimulants do not succeed in infusing enthusiasm in the Woodstockians, let him secure the musical services of Mr. G. E. Foster and Dr. Montague to sing the National Anthem in Woodstock three times a day in open air for the length of time they used to pass here.

Speaking in a general way, the Toronto Star, one of the Canadian papers which kept best its cool senses during the jingo spree of last year, gave this advice to our returned heroes on December 31st last:

#### Get Back to Business.

The men who have come from the war have received welcomes that greatly surprised them. People in country places especially are generally very slow to exhibit enthusiasm over young men who belong to their own towns. Yet in a great many cases young men in khaki have been welcomed in royal style, banqueted and presented with watches and sums of money. They should not harbour the hope that they can continue to walk on air.

The wise ones will get back to earth as soon as they possibly can, will put away their regimentals and get to work again. An old saying may be amended to read that nobody is a hero to the people of his own village.

I must beg pardon to the House for multiplying these quotations from English papers. But I am bound to do so. Should I make such utterances on my own account, they would be called 'manifestations of French disloyalty.' In the same copy of the Gazette which I have just quoted appeared a long editorial dealing with the alleged mutiny of some colonial troops in South Africa. The whole thing is a lecture to British authorities on what they should expect and not expect from colonists:

Lord Kitchener's statement, published in our yesterday's issue, makes it clear that all that occurred was the refusal of some time-expired men to go on duty when ordered to do so. If they are not willing to serve any longer, they cannot be blamed, certainly not by men who were unwilling to serve at all. They were in the field before the C. I. V. and the Household Cavalry, and they have seen the latter return home not without suspicion that social influence had weight in the preference. It has evidently taken some of the British officers a long time to learn how the colonial troops should be handled. The enthusiasm for the war is waning, and the men are probably right in the belief that the rest of the cam-

paige will be mainly police work. They have done all they promised to do, and have done it in a way to make us proud of them.

But the best expression of sentiment in that sense was given by the Evening Telegram, of Toronto, on October 25 last. It appeared as the leading editorial, under the title:

**'Did Well to Come Home.'**

It was not exactly Col. Otter's duty to accept on behalf of the Royal Canadian Regiment Lord Roberts' cordial invitation to remain in Africa until the war was technically over. The instincts of a professional soldier like Col. Otter, do not seem to be in line with the inclinations of all the volunteers under his command. They have their rights and did well to exercise these rights, and not be browbeaten into staying in Africa when they wanted to come home. They gave the empire good service in the hour of danger, and could well afford to leave professional soldiers to complete the remaining stages of the campaign.

This gem of common sense must have been a cause of amazement to all those who heard here its responsible author, the late member for East Toronto, Mr. John Ross-Robertson, lecturing the government for not voting sufficient money to pay for the total maintenance of our troops in South Africa, even if England refused our alms.

Every man of good faith will admit that we are far from the frantic appeals of October, 1899, for troops and horses, for guns and cartridges.

My conclusion to all this is that loyalty is almost as elastic as a politician's conscience. At the start of the war, when nobody in Canada expected it could last more than a few weeks; when the British government wanted only 500 men from Canada—not to fight, but to express our sympathy with Mr. Chamberlain's policy—I was branded as a traitor because I wanted the government to pause a few weeks and give to the representatives of the people an opportunity to discuss the consequences of this new military policy. A year later, when the situation was darker than ever, when the British army found it hard to hold its few positions, and could not prevent the enemy's invasion in British territory, the very men who put me under the ban of British opinion, plainly said to their beloved mother land: 'Get out of the mess; the best you can; for us, we have enough of the game. Come back home, boys; God save the Queen!'

At the end of December last, it was announced that some more Canadians would have a chance to go to Africa, and this time for a long period and a good pay; with full opportunities to loot cattle, to burn houses and farms, to steal clocks, mirrors, jewelry and money, to chop planes just for the fun of it, to turn penniless, on the veldt, women and children at the mercy of barbarous and lustful natives. I take all those words from letters from Canadian volunteers. At the risk of being called a 'little Englander,' I venture the

opinion that Lord Wellington's humane methods of warfare will remain in history as more glorious to the name of Great Britain than Lord Kitchener's improved system. And, perhaps also, the military glory of the wise tactician of the Torres Vedras and of Waterloo will not be totally eclipsed by the ferry trade of Sir Redvers Buller.

Anyhow, when it was decided to raise Canadian recruits for the South African constabulary, the explosion of enthusiasm was not defeaning. On December 31 last, the Toronto Star published an article entitled: 'We need our men at home,' in which I read the following lines:

This country cannot therefore regard as a favour that a thousand of our young men are to be accepted as volunteers for police duty in Africa, Asia, South America, England, or anywhere else. We need them at home. This country has no reason to consider a kindness, either, that commissions are offered our young men in the Imperial army, for these are prizes that wear them away from the tasks for which this country educates them. We need more young men than we can grow and we grow better ones than we can import.

It is all right for this country to jump into the middle of the ring in a time of crisis and strike a few blows for the credit of the family, but what we have to remember is that in making Canada what she ought to be, one native is worth a wagon-load of immigrants.

At the risk of abusing the patience of the House, I will also quote two articles which appeared in the Canadian Military Gazette. I take for granted that this publication is neither an anti-militarist organ nor a French disloyal mouthpiece. The first article was published on January 15 last, and read as follows:

**The South African Police.**

Now that recruiting depots for the South African police are to be established in different sections of the Dominion, much unfavourable comment is heard. Surely the Canadian government did not express a desire to the Imperial authorities that such should be done, and if the latter acted on their own initiative, they certainly took a step that was ill-advised. Our aim in this country is to get population not to send our young men abroad. It appears that ranchers and other of that class, to be found mainly in Manitoba and the Territories, are the men preferred and by holding out the inducement of big pay it is hoped to entice away one thousand or more of the flower of our manhood. Canada can ill spare these men, and as a term in the South African police means, in the large majority of cases, that they will ultimately settle in the country, the Dominion is actually being denuded to populate another portion of the empire.

The Imperial government should be plainly told that, if it is absolutely necessary to have men from Canada to fight for British supremacy in the dark continent, this country will send not 1,000, but at least 10,000, but we have no men to spare for doing routine police duty, while millions of acres of the finest land in the world lay untilled for want of population. Until the men are urgently required, the Canadian authorities should not hold out any inducements to recruits in the country. Canadians wishing to join the police of their own free will should be



permitted to do so, but it is not fair to the Dominion that they should be encouraged to enlist.

On February 19, the same paper came again to the front and said :

#### The S. A. Constabulary.

According to the Army and Navy Gazette, of London, Eng., usually one of the best-informed service journals published in the United Kingdom, the basis of all applications for membership in the South African constabulary is taken to be that those sending in their names desire to settle in South Africa after service with the force.

Such has been strongly suspected in Canada, although the authority have taken the utmost pains to conceal the fact from the public, and the Gazette, after reading the article referred to in our English contemporary, is more strongly than ever opposed to the action of the Canadian militia authorities in encouraging the virtual deportation from our country of a large number—for us—of the best settlers obtainable anywhere in the world.

As has been said on several previous occasions, this journal is not by any means opposed to sending men to fight the empire's battles, if they are required for that purpose, but in this instance it is not even pretended that such is the case, the statement being that they are required for doing police duty in the conquered country, the ultimate aim and object, doubtless, being at the expiration of their three years' term of service that they will be induced to settle in Africa, to the exceeding great detriment of the Dominion.

In this connection, it may be said that the government of New South Wales, being evidently better seized of the facts than ours at Ottawa, have emphatically refused to permit an Imperial officer to recruit for the force in that portion of the empire, and the Gazette is of opinion that recent developments justify the course.

Let all who desire to join the force of their own volition do so without throwing obstacles in the way, but to cajole and encourage men to enlist is not fair to the land we live in.

A few days later, on February 25th, the Montreal Witness, following along the same line, said :

Canadians seem to be taking all too kindly to the establishment among them of recruiting depots, whose object will be to withdraw the most vigorous of our youth from nation-building to the adventure of war. We presume that in every community as full of virility as the Canadian people there will be a certain proportion irresistibly drawn towards such a life. The wild beast has not yet died out of our human nature. If there are some called by nature to military life, and there certainly are many who seem better adapted to success in that than in any other calling, it is better that they should enlist in the service of their own empire than in that of strangers. We cannot, however, look on the whole thing without much regret.

With regard to the attitude of the government of New South Wales, I have gone through the London Times to ascertain the truth; and the first thing I find is a despatch from Sydney, dated February 17, as follows :—

Sydney, N.S.W., Feb. 17.—Sir Alfred Milner having notified the government of New South Wales of his intention to send an officer to recruit in Australia for the South African con-

stabulary, the government has replied that the colony objects to such a proceeding.

From the London Times of February 20, I find the following despatch :

Cape Town, Feb. 18.—There is no foundation for the statement contained in telegrams from London to the effect that Sir Alfred Milner proposed to recruit men in Australia and New Zealand for the South African constabulary, and that the New South Wales government had objected.

For those who have followed the course of Imperial authorities on this war question, it is easy to read between the lines of these despatches. It is now said that no applications were made in Australia or New Zealand for recruits; but the fact seems to be that the British government, having confidentially asked for the opinion of the governments of those colonies as to the feasibility of recruiting, and learning that they were not willing to be played upon by Sir Alfred Milner, the statement was put forth that the request had not been made. I may here also read the following despatch which came in the month of January :

New York, January 14.—The London correspondent of the Tribune says: The announcement is made by the Post that the scheme for raising a colonial police force has been abandoned for the present. The rates of pay were not considered tempting enough by the people living in South Africa, and of 16,000 men who applied to the United Kingdom to join the force, only 500 or so were selected as suitable.

Sir, I was perfectly justified in the opening of my remarks in saying that the British authorities, having found that they could not obtain in South Africa or in Australia recruits for the constabulary organized for the protection of South Africa, they came to this rich land of Canada to ask from us what other British colonies declined to give, and what the only colony directly interested in this war is not able to give.

I may add that the attempts on the part of Imperial authorities in South Africa to keep our young men as settlers is not a new feature of this war. As early as the 24th November last the Montreal Herald's special correspondent with the Strathcona Horse wrote from Potchefstroom a letter which appeared in the Herald of January 5. It begins as follows:—

The eye of the Canadian volunteer is turning towards Rhodesia, the most northern inheritance of the British South African Company, as a prospective place of settlement, attracted by the exceptional inducements offered by the Chartered Company, and the tales heard on the march or by the camp-fire, of the mineral and agricultural wealth of this portion of South Africa. In the ranks of Lord Strathcona's corps are twenty or thirty Canadians who are at present deeply interested in the country, and may yet make it their future home. The special inducements to settlement extended by the British South African Company are offered only to Canadian, Australian and New Zealand volunteers and English Yeomanry who will volunteer for the defence of Rhodesia.

With the Military Gazette, I regret strongly that the Canadian government, which is taxing the people of this country to bring in foreign immigration, should have assisted British authorities in the draining of our best blood for the benefit of Mr. Rhodes. And again that step has been taken without the consent and knowledge of parliament. The cabinet cannot invoke this time the excuse of popular will. I did not hear of the slightest protest against the articles of the Toronto Star and of the Military Gazette which, I think, expressed the general opinion. And it cannot be pretended that this is another case of urgent necessity. On the 8th of January last, Lord Raglan, Under Secretary of State for War, said to a representative of the Associated Press:

The condition of affairs in South Africa absolutely forbids prophecy. You cannot call it war, yet in some respects this is worse than war.

The secret of the whole thing consists in horses. We have enough men there, but not enough mounted men.

A strange war indeed! At the outset, the defeats of the British army were attributed to a lack of strategic science on the part of the mules; and now we are told that the Imperial forces being unable to conquer this remnant of a handful of peasants, horses only can do it. Anyhow, since horses only were required, why did not the government offer to the British authorities all the horses they wanted, and told them to leave here where they are badly needed the men they do not want.

I go further: I say that the moment the government were convinced that the war was over—and convinced they were as early as the 7th of June last when they congratulated the Queen on the end of hostilities—it was their duty to notify the British government that Canadian soldiers should be sent back here at the expiry of their first period of engagement, that is, after six months of service. That duty became imperative when Lord Roberts annexed the two republics and every minister in England boasted that the war was over, and that the few Boer desperadoes who were still foolish enough to keep on fighting should not be considered as belligerents. If I understood well that popular voice which forced the hands of the government, our soldiers went to Africa and we paid them for the defence of the empire. But our purpose was not, I presume, to keep there at the expense of Canada a force of men to loot farms and do police work in a war which is not a war, as Lord Raglan termed it three months ago, or but a 'technical war,' as Mr. Ross-Robertson, of the Evening Telegram, would qualify it.

Coming back to those articles of the Toronto Star, of the Military Gazette, of the Montreal Witness, I am most happy to observe the revival of that robust common sense and of that practical spirit which

every true observer of modern nations admires as the backbone of Anglo-Saxon strength, and to which the Anglo-Saxon shall have to come back if he does not want to see his power vanishing. But, to be impartial, I must point out the weakness of reasoning which characterizes those articles. If we admit the desirability of military expeditions outside of Canada, even scarce and accidental, we must prepare for them. Not only must we go in expensive purchases of weapons and ammunitions, we must also develop a military spirit in our peaceful community. If we make ours the quarrels of Great Britain; if we wish to have at least 10,000 young men ready to start at England's first call in Europe or Africa, in Asia or Oceania, we must prepare the youth of this country for such emergencies. From the cradle, through the kindergarten, the school, the college, the university, the ear of the Canadian boy must be made familiar with the clang of arms and the strident appeal of trumpets. He must be taught to drill and to shoot and to love camping and loafing with spurs at his boots and a sword at his belt. Instead of war being painted to his eyes under its true colors as one of the chastisements of God over a sinful humanity, as one of the worst social scourges, more cruel and detrimental to the welfare of nations than cholera or famine, his young enthusiastic mind must be imbued with the barbarous, anti-Christian notion that war is the true path to glory, the most healthful and noble aim of a strong people. And the result will be that, not only by loyalty, not only in cases of imperative necessity, not only to defend the flag and the land, but simply to follow its new instincts, the 'flower of our manhood' will be ready to start at any time, for any cause, good or bad. In time of peace, that new martial education of the youth will lower to their mind the ordinary but fruitful occupations of life. And thus will be lost to our country the best of its blood, of its intelligence, of its vital strength. Military passion is brutal, and cannot be controlled easily by reason. I am glad to find out that some organs of the English-speaking community are beginning to agree with me; but without any desire to discourage their honest and well-directed efforts, I may be allowed to say that if they want to avoid the consequences they must try to extirpate the causes. They have helped in throwing a bad seed to the national ground; if they dread the harvest, let them go and unroot the crop; cutting a few of the heaviest ears is but a childish and useless game.

Coming now to the province of Quebec, the attempt made by the London Times to interpret the almost unanimous vote given to the government in that province as an approval of the war, or of the participation

of Canada in the conflict, is simply preposterous. I regret that some members of the cabinet have contributed to propound that false impression. They may have done it with a good purpose; but what is the use? Not only good intentions, but honesty, clear-sightedness, and frankness, are the best policy always.

At a banquet which was tendered to him at Toronto, on the 11th of December last, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) was reported by the Toronto Globe as having said on Imperial issues:

In the province of Quebec the main attack that was made upon the government was on account of the Imperial policy which was followed by our right hon. friend. (Hear, hear.) The issue that was mainly raised there between the Prime Minister and his supporters and their opponents was as to whether Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the French Canadian Prime Minister, who had inaugurated the British preference, who had sent the troops to South Africa, whether he was to be supported in taking that action; and we have only to look at the newspapers which were circulated by our Conservative friends in the province of Quebec, at the literature which was circulated by those gentlemen in Quebec, to see that that was the main issue upon which they appealed to the provinces of Quebec, and their appeal was that the people of Quebec should declare against Sir Wilfrid Laurier because he was an Imperial statesman, because he had thrown in his lot with the British empire. (Hear, hear.) What did the people of Quebec decide? What was their verdict? Was it for the men who attacked our hon. friend? No; it was an endorsement of everything he had done to cement Canada more closely to the British Empire.

The hon. gentleman appealed to the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) to uphold his views. But these two gentlemen remained perfectly silent on that point, and for good reason: both of them were too polite to contradict their colleague and too sincere to strengthen him in his delusion. Of course, this opinion of the Minister of the Interior was an after-Toronto-dinner thought, and this may be pleaded as an extenuating circumstance. The hon. gentleman is, I know, a total abstainer, and the very opposite of a jingo; but it may be he was affected by the Toronto atmosphere in the same way as a friend of mine who was once visiting the London docks: just by passing through the huge warehouses where all sorts of liquors are stored, he was nearly intoxicated by the alcoholic emanations which filled the air. In Toronto, jingo microbes are such in quality and quantity that even when stimulated only by Apollinaris water, they can affect the most solid brain.

The case of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) is harder to diagnose—unless I call it an outburst of juvenile enthusiasm. Not that I don't acknowledge and respect the experience and solid mind of the hon. gentleman; but in every man there are two men,

and in every minister there are at least three—unless the man is perfectly null by himself and takes all his brains in his portfolio, which is far from being the case with the hon. minister. So that a member of the cabinet may very sincerely entertain and express quite opposite views on the same subject, according to whether he uses his personal brains or his ministerial mind. In spite of his keen experience and sound judgment as a man and as a politician, the Minister of Inland Revenue is officially the Benjamin of the cabinet. I think he relied exclusively on his young and fresh ministerial brains, naturally excited with the joy of victory, when he gave his opinion of the Quebec vote on the 9th of November last. He was reported as follows by the Ottawa correspondent of the Montreal Herald:

It was not at all a question of race or contingents. Even Mr. Chauvin, who voted in the House against sending contingents, was defeated by Mayor Préfontaine, who supported their going, while the majorities of both Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monet were materially reduced.

After having referred to the Manitoba school question as one of the most important issues in the contest, he added:

The second topic of most opposition speakers was the increase of debt resulting from sending soldiers to South Africa at a cost of \$5,000,000. This was the complaint against Laurier; Mr. Chauvin's defeat was the answer of the people. And by the Ottawa Evening Journal:

The two great issues which the opposition had put forward were the Manitoba school question and the sending of the troops to South Africa. The opposition asked the electors to condemn the Laurier administration because the school question was not satisfactorily settled by the government, and also because the premier had sent the contingents to South Africa. It was Sir Wilfrid particularly who was held responsible for this. The vote has shown that the government has been endorsed for its action in regard to these questions. Mr. Chauvin, Conservative, who voted against sending the contingent, was defeated. The majorities of Monet and Bourassa were reduced.

I regret, or rather I rejoice, that in my case, the hon. minister spoke under misinformation. My majority was larger by a few votes than in 1896, in spite of the fact that the lists were much less favourable and especially that 1,000 voters at least were absent from the localities where I took the strongest vote.

Mr. COWAN. You were lucky.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, I was lucky to represent an intelligent constituency. My friend from Laprairie and Napleville (Mr. Monet), whom I am so happy to see here again, ready to fight with me for the Canadian flag, should we even remain for some time yet in a glorious isolation, could tell to the House that the reduction of his majority was due to causes entirely foreign to the war question. In fact, his opponent took the same view as he did of the war question and said he would have voted

in the same way as my hon. friend did on this matter. I could also point out the vote in the counties of Two Mountains, Bagot, Charlevoix and Maskinongé, where members who voted with us on this question were all returned by increased majorities. I do not think that any of those gentlemen receded, during the electoral campaign, from their former position on this question. I know that in Charlevoix and Maskinongé especially, the members-elect (Messrs. Angers and Legris) fought the battle straight on our lines. And I know as a matter of fact that before going to his political death in Maskinongé, Sir Adolphe Caron vainly endeavoured for several weeks to get the nomination in his former constituency, Three Rivers and St. Maurice; and if he could not succeed, his position on the war question was to a certain extent an obstacle in his way.

Since the Minister of Inland Revenue has mentioned the defeat of Mr. Chauvin in Terrebonne as the result of his vote on my motion of the 13th of March last, and as an evidence of the sentiment of Québec in favour of our military expedition to the Transvaal, I feel bound to give a few details about that election. I have here the political manifesto of the present member for Terrebonne (Mr. Préfontaine), who represents at the same time the riding of Maisonneuve. It is a long and interesting document treating of the Manitoba school question, of the financial prosperity of the country, of the progress in agriculture—but not a paragraph, not a line, not a word about the war, or the sending of contingents, or Imperialism. It appeared in *L'Avenir du Nord*, a Liberal paper published at St. Jérôme, and largely circulated not only in Terrebonne county, but throughout the whole district. This paper, ably edited, has not a little contributed to the liberalizing of the counties of Terrebonne and Two Mountains, those old fortresses of the Conservative party. It is one of the strongest anti-Imperialistic publications in Québec, one which denounced most bitterly the sending of troops to Africa; approved all along of my position, and congratulated Mr. Chauvin on his vote of the 13th of March last. I may say even that it has gone very often much farther than my own sentiments would lead me. I am anti-Imperialistic, but strongly attached to British institutions; this paper is almost a secessionist. One may think that it changed its tone in order to support the Liberal candidate against Mr. Chauvin. Not at all; on the contrary. First, in the same copy announcing that Mr. Préfontaine had been chosen as the Liberal candidate, Mr. Chauvin was denounced as a cowardly capitulator on the question of Imperialism. The article dated September 13, begins as follows:

Mr. Chauvin, Capitular.

The county of Terrebonne is represented at Ottawa by a 'capitular';

I do not know if my hon. friends whose native tongue is English quite understand the meaning of that word. It means not merely a capitulator, but a cowardly capitulator; one who capitulates without reason.

—Mr. Adolphe Chauvin himself.

At Beauharnois he declared that he was following Sir Charles Tupper's flag with the whole Conservative-yellow-blus-Tory party united as one man. . . . Ha! Mr. Chauvin has tried to play the man of character at Ottawa with the Bourassas, the Monets and the Ethiers; but our representative was really not built to keep up that role. He has capitulated! Nay, he has surrendered without striking a blow. He does better: He goes back with arms and baggage to the camp of the militarists and the mountebanks of Britishism.

In the next issue *L'Avenir du Nord* published an article on Mr. Préfontaine's candidature. After a well-deserved eulogy of our worthy colleague, it goes on as follows:

One may tell us: 'All what you say is very true, but Mr. Préfontaine is an Imperialist.'

What evidence on this point can be given to us?

No, we do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine, who has in the past given so many striking evidences of patriotism and of national zeal, may have, as a wish in his heart and as an article of his programme the participation of Canada in the foreign wars of the British Empire. No, we do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine admits, that in principle, we should give millions and shed our blood to defend England in conflicts, the motives of which are more than suspicious. We do not believe that Mr. Préfontaine is in favour of a military imperialism which would afflict our peaceful country with the horrible wound of militarism, and this for the benefit of another nation.

Then, after proving that the government's policy on that question was less dangerous than Sir Charles Tupper's, it says:

Well! Mr. Préfontaine who, as a supporter of the government, has approved the sending of contingents, but under the condition that this action shall not commit us in the future, is yet to be preferred to Mr. Adolphe Chauvin, who, after having pronounced himself against the sending of contingents in the House, walks now on the steps of Sir Charles Tupper whose Imperialistic ideas he endorses without restriction. . . . On that question of imperialism which we have fought and shall always fight, Mr. Préfontaine is less to be feared than Mr. Chauvin.

Then, on October 4, appeared an article, the third of a series, in which the Imperialistic tendencies of both parties were cleverly analysed—the conclusion being that Tory Imperialism is worse than Liberal Imperialism, that between the two evils the less should be chosen, and Mr. Préfontaine preferred to Mr. Chauvin.

Then, on October 11:

Is Mr. Chauvin of the same opinion as Sir Charles Tupper, his leader, who solicited the government to send contingents to Africa—or is he not?

Then, on October 25, appeared a leading article on 'Responsibilities as to the send-

ing of contingents.' The three following paragraphs give an exact idea of the whole :

The responsibility of the military expedition to the Transvaal falls entirely on Sir Charles Tupper and the whole English Conservative press . . . . The responsible authors of the contingents are Sir Charles Tupper, Mr. Bergeron and the Conservative party . . . . The great culprit in the contingent question is Sir Charles Tupper, of whom Mr. Chauvin is now the candidate.

And, finally, on November 8, appreciating the result :

Mr. Chauvin is defeated and he deserved it. Men who denounce Imperialism and who brand themselves as the most faithful supporters of declared Imperialists, cannot expect their electors to accept to be laughed at more than five consecutive years.

One can hardly find in all these quotations any trace of the slightest approval of the sending of Canadian troops to the Transvaal. And I do not believe that the present member for Terrebonne (Mr. Préfontaine) will claim his victory as a triumph for Imperialism.

Speaking now of the province at large, the truth is that the question was minimized almost to the point of annihilation in most of the constituencies. On September 24, there was a large meeting at St. Hyacinthe, the residing place of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Bernier), the county seat of his constituency, and the centre of an extensive and prosperous district. The Prime Minister was there and addressed the meeting in his usual eloquent and convincing manner. He dealt at length with all the issues of the day, including the school question; but not a word fell from his lips touching the African question or any of its sub-issues. The Minister of Inland Revenue referred briefly, but not enthusiastically to that subject. He was reported as follows by La Presse of the following day :

It is stated that Laurier is an Imperialist; but is it, because the Liberals are loyal subjects that they are so accused ?

Is it because the government has allowed the sending of a contingent to Africa that its members should be branded as Imperialists.

As you see, the title of Imperialist was not accepted in Quebec by ministers of the Crown with the same pride as by their honourable colleagues and supporters in Ontario, where it was set up as a most glorious and brilliant plume.

It is possible that some electors see a danger for the future of our country in the sending of a contingent; but the government has but acceded to the wishes of the Imperial government, and allowed the recruiting of volunteers and nothing else. Can the government be reproached with having decided to pay the expenditure of those volunteers ? But, is it said, supposing the thing reoccurs ? Well, said Mr. Bernier, let us wait for events to come; the government will study then the necessity of sending a contingent. What would have been the result of Sir Wilfrid Laurier refusing to send a regiment to Africa ? He would have been thrown down from power and Tupper would be now in office. He

indeed is the one who would have sent contingents; 5,000 men would not have been sufficient for Sir Charles !

La Patrie of the same day gave a shorter but similar account of that speech :

He (Mr. Bernier) then treats the contingents question, saying he approved of the attitude which his leader had taken on that matter and that the sending of troops did not mean Imperialism. Is it because Canadians went freely and voluntarily to the secession war that they became by that fact Americans ? Have those who went to the Philippines, or to Cuba become Philipinos or Cubans ? We are not Imperialists, but we are loyal subjects of the British Crown and of the free institutions under which we are living.

His own organ, La Tribune de St. Hyacinthe, after a week's time, left to the friendly supervision of the editor, gave a report of the hon. gentleman's declarations almost identical with that of La Presse. A few days previous, the hon. minister had spoken at St. Hilaire, in your own riding, I believe, Mr. Speaker; and his short remarks on the war question were reported as follows by his organ, La Tribune, on September 21 :

Our enemies say that the Laurier government has sent volunteers to South Africa ! It is not correct; the government gave orders to nobody. It simply lent its help to good wills. Had they been in power, what would have been done by those who denounce us ? Ask Mr. Bergeron, who has just cried out at Alexandria that England would have only to ask in order to receive, should they be in power.

In another column of the same copy of the same paper, a leading article, entitled ' Soyons Français—Let us be straight,' discusses the war question with its Conservative antagonist, Le Courrier de St. Hyacinthe. The following paragraph shows the spirit of the article :

But the argument which has above all played upon the nerves of our confreres is the one, very clear indeed, which proves that the country has been most fortunate to have as its leader Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the time the contingents were sent. We shall have \$2,000,000 to pay above our share of the bloodshed in that unfortunate Transvaal war. Every French Canadian knows that had Tupper directed the affairs of the country at that moment, he would not have stopped there, in spite of his furious denunciations.

I could keep the House for hours on similar quotations; these are sufficient to define the position taken by the government organs and supporters in Quebec, and to show that their victory in that old Canadian province can hardly be counted as a triumph of Imperialism, and even as an approval of our military expedition to the Transvaal. The straight ministerial candidates, the devout believers, as I may call them, did not approve of the war or of the sending of Canadian troops to South Africa. They kept aloof from the subject as much as possible; and when attacked by their opponents and questioned by their followers on that point, their invariable reply was that the government could not resist the move-

ment, that Canada was not committed to any future contribution to English wars, and especially that, had the Tory leaders been in power, they would have sent more men and expended more money than the government. They made their contention good by quoting Sir Charles Tupper's telegrams and speeches, and his leading supporters' utterances. They divulged to the people the scant hypocrisy of the Tory party, and proved, with undeniable evidence, that while their opponents in Quebec were accusing the government for having dragged us in Imperial concerns and sold Canada to England, their compeers in Ontario were denouncing in rabid terms Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the traitor Tarte and his French-dominated cabinet, which had consented but reluctantly and meanly to go to the rescue of the empire, and when forced to do so under the powerful and patriotic pressure of Sir Charles the Great.

I may have hurt the feelings of the ministerialists in showing the somewhat double game they have played on this question; they have undoubtedly shown through all this crisis a lack of nerve most painful to all those who had been attracted to the old Liberal party by its moral courage, its disinterested attachment to principle and its joyful disposition to prefer truth to success. I leave to my friends on this side of the House to decide for themselves if this softening of their temperament must be attributed to the effects of la grippe or to the sweets of power. I hope the former cause is the real one; because the latter would prove that their stern virtue, like that of certain vestals of old and modern times, simply waited for a propitious occasion to fall.

But, the government and their supporters may find some solace for their weakness by contemplating the perversion of their rivals. While the Liberals had the excuse of being on the defence, and only played that double game with a certain timid and blushing indecency, the Tories threw themselves soul and body into the abysses of sin. Members of the late parliament will remember the very patriotic attitude of the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), his speech on the war, and his noisy hand-clapping when the Prime Minister refused to accept my motion ratifying the constitutional reservations contained in the order in council of October, 1899. I would respectfully advise the right hon. gentleman, when he is applauded from the other side, to repeat, silently if he likes, what I say openly when I am afflicted with the same evil: *Timeo danaos et dona ferentes.* I say silently, because, on this question of Imperialism, the right hon. gentleman would be more exposed than I am to become fastidious at quoting the Virgilian verse.

Now, I will quote a few words of the speech of the hon. member for Montmorency on that war question:

It was an evidence that all the colonies were united with each other to prove not only their patriotism and their loyalty to the British Crown, but to prove that the empire cannot be attacked in any one of its parts without all the other parts coming to its rescue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. But wait a little to see whether you will approve the second quotation:

Sir, the people of all the provinces of the Dominion are carried away by this patriotic conception of their duties, and I as a French Canadian will not stand aloof and remain an indifferent spectator of the tremendous struggle which the British Empire is engaged in at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I now invite hon. gentlemen who say 'hear, hear' to listen to another declaration from the same gentlemen whom they applauded last session as one of the patriotic French Canadians standing for a united empire.

A few days after the session was over, there was a big Conservative rally at Kamouraska, where Messrs. Casgrain, Chapais, Bergeron and other pontiffs of that dying worship once called the Quebec Conservative party, gathered and fulminated their first excommunication decrees of the season. The member for Montmorency made an appeal to the electors of Kamouraska against the Imperialistic tendencies of the Liberal party, and in a most pathetic display of paternal sentiment he cried out to the people:

I am ready to see my only son fly at the defence of my country; but I refuse to sacrifice him for the quarrels of England, though just they be.

Why do not hon. members opposite applaud now? They are silent.

But I need not go out of my own constituency to give an illustration of the tactics of the Conservative party. Of course, in Labelle, the ground was much clearer than in most of the other constituencies. I fought the battle on that question, though I had great trouble in keeping my opponent on these lines; he wanted to do as all the straight party candidates in Quebec, and try to shift the issue. His position was that the cause of our expedition was to be found in the Prime Minister's speeches at the jubilee; that the honour of the country was engaged, and that, after all, the inconveniences of the war were well compensated by our sales of hay, cheese and horses; a business point of view, as you see. In fact, he approved more than he disapproved of our participation in the war. But his eloquence dealers were more decided in their opinions. In the English-speaking section of the county, the Tory committee sent a young patriot, who said that in Labelle it was no question of Liberals or Conservatives, of Laurier or Tupper, of good or bad administration; it was and should be:

'Down with Bourassa, who opposed the Canadian contingents to South Africa!' In the northern extremity of the county, all French-speaking, Mr. Nantel, an ex-provincial minister—the same gentleman who, for over a year, in his organ, *Le Monde Canadien*, and in his public utterances, had been denouncing the war, the contingents, and the Imperialistic movement—came full of ardour and denounced me as a hypocrite, because, although I voted against the war and declared myself ready to oppose any future military expedition, I still called myself a Liberal and a supporter of the government on its administrative policy. He admitted that Sir Charles Tupper had some slight Imperialistic tendencies, but almost imperceptible compared to the deep Imperialism of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The former was only in favour of commercial Imperialism, based on reciprocal terms; whilst the latter was in favour of commercial Imperialism, all in favour of England; of political Imperialism, swamping our legislative independence; and of military Imperialism, committing us to participation in all Imperial wars.

In a letter to his constituents, published shortly after the crushing defeat of his party and the downfall of his dynasty, the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said:

No one would be surprised, still less complain, that natural sympathy existed in Quebec for a French Canadian leader, but when the French Canadians have almost to a man rallied around him, can we believe that this result has been due to any other cause than race feeling, so fostered, manipulated and developed by Messrs. Tarte, Bernier, Bourassa, Monet, and others, skillfully played up by the Prime Minister himself. At any rate, our French Canadian friends who have been swamped by this temporary craze of Québec, tell us so.

I am ready to give to the hon. gentleman the benefit of extenuating circumstances. A convict is allowed twenty-four hours to curse his judges. A defeated leader, hurt not only in his political and personal ambitions, but also in his filial sentiments, for which I can but admire the hon. gentleman, may be given a few weeks to exhale his bitterness. But that natural explosion of bad temper should not have gone to the point of slandering his opponents and a large proportion of his fellow-citizens. As to the general accusation of racial appeals made by the Liberal party to the French Canadians, and as to the reply given to those appeals, I will say a word later on. As to my personal position, the hon. gentleman should apologize to at least one of the gentlemen with whose names he coupled mine in his letter. I mean the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier). I have for the hon. minister the greatest personal esteem and friendship, and I trust he entertains the same feelings towards my humble self. But to put him and me in the same canoe, as far as this question is concerned, is rather grotesque. Why? Ever

since the hon. gentleman entered the cabinet, we paddled in the very opposite direction. He wanted to run down the stream, and I persisted in facing the current. The chief French Conservative organ in Montreal, *Le Journal*, even announced one day that I would accept the candidature against him in St. Hyacinthe. I must say, however, that this was a pure Tupperism.

As to my appeals to the electorate, I defy the hon. member for Pictou here and now to quote one sentence of my public or private utterances justifying his accusation. Let him search all the newspapers in which my speeches throughout the whole province were reported—and I give him free access to respectable organs of all shades of opinion, both English and French; let him unearth any witness, French or English, Scotch or Irish, Italian, German or Belgian—all those nationalities are represented in my constituency; let him pick the man, credible under oath, who will say to my face that I have resorted to any racial appeal in my election or previous to it, within or without my county. He will never find that man; because such appeals I never made; and I could not have made them for two excellent reasons: First, the idea that the Transvaal question and all its incidents and consequences in Canada could be discussed on racial lines, always appeared to me as most foolish and absurd; second, nothing is more repugnant to my heart and conscience as that basis of political argument. And what is not in my heart has never reached my lips. I do not expect to ever be a minister of the Crown or a Knight of this or a Commander of that; but I cherish the ambition that my humble name shall never be used to enrich the Canadian glossary with a synonym to Tupperism. True, racial prejudices were aroused in my county during the last campaign; they fermented constantly from the day I resigned my seat to appeal to my constituents on this question in October, 1899, until the very last polling hour of the 7th November, 1900. But they were not raised by me, nor on my behalf; they were set against me by a small group of English-speaking Liberals and Conservatives, who denounced me for a year as a French rebel and a traitor, and thereby gave votes to my opponents, the candidate of gentlemen opposite. In all justice to that gentleman, I must say that if he profited by those tactics, I do not think he was responsible for them. That campaign was started long before he was a candidate. I could have retaliated and made counter appeals to my French-speaking constituents, who represent at least two-thirds of the electorate of La-belle. But, I did not, and I would not have done it, had even my success depended on those tactics. Sir, it is my pride, my legitimate pride that the position which I took on this question, I kept it rigidly on the solid ground of respect to the constitution

and of true devotion to Canadian interests in preference to Mr. Chamberlain's political aims; and in doing so I remained all along faithful to the true traditions of British Liberalism. I am happy to say that my attitude was well understood by the free citizens who sent me here. Although I lost a good many English-speaking supporters, the true old Liberal Scotch stood by me. I never felt prouder in my life than at a public meeting held in a thorough Scotch settlement of my county, two days previous to the election, when two of the leading residents, one Conservative and the other Liberal, told me with the approval of their fellow-citizens: 'We are especially satisfied with your position on the war question. You stood independently for Canadian rights. England is rich enough to look after her quarrels; let us mind our own business, and live peacefully in Canada.'

Speaking now of the general position taken by the Conservative party on this question: I hold in my hands two electoral pamphlets which were largely circulated by Tory heebers in Ontario and Quebec. The former is a leaflet entitled 'The Case of Bourassa and Monet'; it contains extracts from our speeches carefully stripped of the context which only could give our correct and complete views on the war question, and it denounces the government for not having excommunicated us. The copy I have has been sent to me by an elector of the riding of West York. The other document is the famous pamphlet No. 6, being one of a series of brochures prepared, printed and sent broadcast to the four corners of the province of Québec by the Central Conservative Committee of Montreal. This pamphlet is well known to all the members of this House. Apart from the school question to which it refers, it arraigns the Liberal government for having dragged us in English wars; it reprints my motion of March 13, 1900, and extracts from the Prime Minister's reply to my speech; and it contends that the Liberal party is responsible for the introduction of Imperialism in Canada. The title is in itself a poem:

Imperial Federation—Laurier approves of it,  
Tupper condemns it.

South African War—Laurier says we shall take part in other British wars if needed.

And, mind you, the trade of this gem was not lessened for a moment after the pious denunciation of Sir Charles Tupper. I really think that this very denunciation lost more votes to Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec than any of the other blunders he and his friends committed—and indeed they were numerous and gigantic! It opened the eyes of the few Conservatives who still naively believed that their leader was the great opponent of Imperialism; but above all, it convinced a great many more that the Tory party in its desperate effort to climb to power was prepared to resort to any means. The result was that many votes given to Liberal can-

didates were not inspired so much by love and admiration for the party in power than by a thorough disgust for Tory tactics. This may seem hard on the opposition and doubtfully flattering to the government, but it is true. I hope the selection of the present leader of the opposition, whom I am pleased to honour as a broad-minded man and a true patriot, means that the Conservative party is opening its eyes to its misdeeds of late years and preparing to go back to its most respectable traditions, those of the time of Macdonald and Cartier. I am one of those who believe in the necessity of a sound opposition, as well as of a good government. But a bad seed has been thrown to the ground and it needs to be exposed thoroughly in order that it may be sterilized. Like the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), several Conservative leaders and organs attributed their defeat to the French cry in Quebec. It seems as if they did not realize that the people from that province do not only read their French newspapers, but follow up closely at the same time the movement of ideas in the other parts of the Dominion. It is true that the people of Québec voted largely in favour of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The right hon. gentleman will pardon me for naming him. It is the best way to express the meaning of the vote given in favour of his government by all the French-speaking groups of Canada. But I deny utterly that this vote implies a spirit of French domination or racial exclusiveness. The French Canadians did not vote for the Prime Minister because he was a French Canadian; but the Prime Minister having been led to the pinnacle of power by the people of Canada, they did not want to see him thrown down simply and solely because he was a French Canadian. Mr. Tarte having been selected by his leader as Minister of Public Works and having done good service in that capacity, they did not see why he should be scouted because he was a French Canadian, and thought fit to say so. And I claim emphatically that it was the right and the duty of my countrymen to do so. Had they done otherwise, they would have proved basely unworthy of the free institutions which their fathers struggled so long and so painfully to obtain; unworthy of the noble flag which guarantees the equality of all nationalities and creeds in this land; unworthy to be the subjects of the Queen, who was herself a living example of toleration. The French vote is not the challenge of a race to another. It is the calm, dignified, constitutional reply from a worthy class of citizens, from one-third of the Canadian people, to the frantic appeals of fanatics. It is an assertion of liberty, of equal rights, of true British citizenship. And as such it should be applauded by all men of good-will who sincerely wish the welfare of Canada. And no one should speak of garrisoning British troops at Quebec to face possible emergencies. If our word of honour kept true for 140 years, and sealed



twice with our bloodshed in defence of the British flag when assailed by the English-speaking Puritan fathers, uncles and cousins of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is not a sufficient guarantee of our loyalty, a British garrison in Quebec would not make it any better. A few red coats would just be the proper thing to make us, not pro-Boers, but real Boers.

But to interpret the French Canadian vote as an approval of the special action of the government in sending Canadian soldiers to the Transvaal, and further still, as an expression of Imperialistic sentiment, is so absurd that nobody from that province, I think, will venture to make that assertion here—unless one cares very little for truth or accuracy. On the contrary, I affirm categorically that the strength of the Liberal vote in Quebec was largely increased by the anti-war feeling, though, I repeat, the question was kept as much as possible as a side issue. As the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said in France, 99 per cent of the French Canadians detest this war, as the whole civilized world does, as nearly one-half, if not more, of the United Kingdom does. They think that it could have been averted by arbitration: they believe that the political difficulties in the Transvaal did not justify it; they are convinced that Mr. Rhodes's rapacity, that Mr. Chamberlain's arrogant and brutal refusal to arbitrate, were the real causes which precipitated the conflict; they wished that it should be stopped. The Colonial Secretary and his faithful may call them pro-Boers. They are pro-Boers, just as Mr. Bryce, Mr. Morley, Mr. Courtney, Sir Robert Reid, Sir Edward Clarke and millions of Englishmen and Scotchmen. They are not pro-Boers because they are anti-British. But their instinctive sympathy goes to a small nation struggling for independence. Their fathers have been forced to rebellion and led to exile or dragged to the scaffold by a policy similar to Mr. Chamberlain's, and a repression similar to Lord Kitchener's; they still remember of Lord Colborne and his farm burnings at St. Eustache and St. Benoit. Peace and liberty were restored here by a policy the kind of which Lord Grey and Mr. Gladstone inaugurated in South Africa and his true disciples are urging now to be applied anew. Supposing their feelings went as far as rejoicing at the success of Boer arms, they should no more be taxed with disloyalty than William Pitt when he openly vowed for the triumph of American rebels, because, in his opinion, that triumph would open the eyes of the British nation and crush down that spirit of arrogant domination which had seized at that time the rulers and the people of England, and was leading the kingdom to its perdition.

Now, as far as the contribution of Canada in this war is concerned, it is no use to make any mistake about it. Inasmuch as it was discussed before the people of Quebec, the action of the government has not

been approved but excused; and excused on the ground that it was not a precedent and that the Tories were more to be dreaded on that question than the Liberals.

There is a fact, a great national feature which our English-speaking neighbours do not realize perhaps, but upon which they should open their eyes. While they have been wandering between narrow provincialism, whence we all started, and unbounded Imperialism, we have been developing quietly but constantly on the solid ground of Canadianism. We may be from their standpoint less British, but we are more thoroughly, more exclusively and, I may be allowed to say, in all good spirit, better Canadians than they are.

I have quoted the London Times previous to the election and its false deductions of the vote after it was taken. I will now commend to the attention of the members of the House a series of letters written from Canada to the Manchester Guardian by a distinguished English journalist, Mr. Harold Spender. That gentleman came to Canada and remained here during the electoral contest in order to study by himself the real sentiments of the Canadian electorate and especially of the French Canadians. He very soon grasped the true situation. I may be permitted to quote a few extracts from that interesting correspondence:

With some similarity to our recent struggle in Great Britain, both Conservative and Liberal candidates, with very few exceptions, tumble over one another in applauding the empire and waving the flag. But behind all these party appearances is the solid, sombre fact, which neither party can conceal, that the French Canadians hate the war and are using most of their political influence to oppose the war policy. In short, like their friends in Great Britain, the Tories out here are just trying to crush the Liberal party by the cry of 'pro-Boer.' Another bond of empire, indeed! But under this there are tragic possibilities, for by all this they are gradually alienating the French Canadians and dividing race from race.

In another letter, speaking of the lack of interest which the war question, as it was discussed in Canada, would offer to his English readers, he says:

They may even prefer that the Canadians should reserve to themselves the right of discussing, a year after the event, whether Sir Wilfrid Laurier sent away the Canadian contingent a month too late or too soon. It is not for us to enter into that domestic quarrel, which is really the only form in which the war question has been seriously raised here outside the constituency of Mr. Bourassa.

I have said that the Canadians have not fully considered the issues of the South African war, and if any Canadian reads these words I shall probably be fiercely blamed for this opinion. Well, I have talked to many on the subject, and I could number on the fingers of one hand those whom I have found familiar with the causes of the quarrel or the details of the despatches.

Of course, the majority of Canadians support Laurier in the 'contingent' policy. But if Tupper had been in power the opposition of the

French Canadians, whose sympathies are with the Boers, would have made it impossible. As it is, Laurier persuaded Quebec, and Ontario had already taken the lead in urgency. But though the French Canadians follow their idol, even in his South African policy, their real mind is voiced by Tarte, with his 'no precedent' cry. That is the issue of the future—is the South African war to be a precedent? The Imperialists of Toronto are raising it by pressing that arms should be stored and barracks built in order that Canada may become a military power ready to support the empire in any venture. Quebec Liberals are sullenly but obstinately opposed to all this. But men like to know what they are fighting about, and thus the war has raised the profoundest issues of Imperial government. How is it that none of these issues have been raised in the political warfare here? I have already noted that there is no discussion and no real knowledge about South African questions in Canada; the war is now scantily reported, and no interest is taken in the settlement. This is partly parochialism—

I draw the attention of my hon. colleagues to the following words:

—but partly also due to a certain lack of courage that runs through all Canadian politics. As in the States, so in Canada; politics are much dominated by electioneering. Perhaps we ought not to preach, but there is in English politics a tradition handed down from men like Bright and Cobden, and sometimes dimly followed, that principle is more important than party or place. Canada still wants that tradition of political martyrdom.

I will end these quotations by the following remarks on the subject of Imperialism as viewed in Ontario. They were written from Toronto after the elections:

The majority of business men know that peace is the most important asset to Canada, and many look askance on the whole Imperialist movement as dangerous to the progress of the country. 'How do we know,' said one to me to-day, 'that we may not be drawn into trouble any day? One never feels safe.'

This is an expression of opinion with regard to Canada; and the other day the statement was published that the New Zealand government were urging the British government to use their influence in the Asiatic sea to acquire a couple of islands in the neighbourhood of New Zealand, because of that swelling sentiment of aggrandizement which is now seizing the whole British world. New Zealand also wants to form its little confederation; it wants to enlarge and expand. Suppose the British government acceded to that request, and suppose on its way to realize it, it came into conflict with the interests of some other European power, and war were declared, we Canadians, in pursuance of this new policy which has been entered upon, might be called upon to expend money and send soldiers to help New Zealand in her schemes of extension and aggrandizement.

I have dealt with military Imperialism at some greater length than I wished to do. But, I felt bound to set myself right, at the opening of this parliament on that vital

question of the relations between Great Britain and her colonies. In spite of the efforts of scared politicians to shift the issue or to convince themselves that the question is not at stake, this is to be the great political and national problem of the near future throughout the empire. The so-called statesmen and their followers who scorn the idea and pretend to believe that this is only a temporary movement of opinion, are simply imitating the ostrich in the desert, when being chased by the hunter, it conceals its head under its wing and thinks it is safe because it does not see the danger. I thought it my duty also to tell the truth—not the political truth, not the party truth, but the plain truth—about the real feelings of the French Canadians on that question. The eccentricity of my position in this House allows me that freedom of speech. I did not do it with the purpose of arousing racial feelings; on the contrary. The best way to avoid national frictions is not by imagining that all sections of this country entertain the same opinion, should even that opinion be the best; but by looking thoroughly through the minds and hearts of all the racial groups which form the nation in order to prepare a sound public opinion based on mutual respect and conciliation. My utterances have not been inspired either by a sentiment of animosity or indifference towards the British flag and British connection; on the contrary again. It is because I prize highly the advantages of British institutions which we have made ours—in spite even of British authorities—that I believe it is an imperative duty to us all to prevent any danger that might threaten them in the future. Should we leave the British government and the British people under misapprehensions as to what they can expect from Canada—not in a time of enthusiastic ferment, but when the popular mind will set again on its normal basis—the moment might come when they thought they could rely upon us for more than what we would be ready to give. A mistake of that kind would be the cause of serious complications which for my part I wish to be avoided.

I go further. This war and its bearing on British and colonial concerns have led me to a new and deeper study of British history, of British institutions, of British politics, of British character. And the more I have analysed the vital parts and the solid limbs of that splendid body politic, its strong nerves and its rich blood, the wider has grown my admiration for Great Britain. I used to be a contented British subject, as most of my countrymen are; I feel now the full pride of British citizenship. But the Britain that I love and admire is that noble, progressive, industrious, peace-loving nation which has done so much for the development and the welfare of humanity; that mother of true liberalism who, from the time of Simon de Montfort

down to the days of William Ewart Gladstone, through good and bad fortune, under the sun of her glorious days as well as in the midst of political storms, worked slowly, but steadily, to the betterment and the reform of her laws, of her constitution, of her political and social life. The Britain that I love is that great apostle of liberty, who preached and practiced the worship of freedom for herself, but who respected also the rights of others. The Britain that I love is that steady, laborious, persevering community of workers, of settlers, of tradesmen, who while enriching themselves have thrown open to the world so many hidden treasures. The Britain that I love was boastful of her qualities, but she did not refuse to listen to the voice of her conscience and never hesitated to correct and to expiate her crimes and her weaknesses. And the more I have known to love that Britain, the true Britain, the more I have hated and cursed the vampires who are now trying to suck and to poison her blood.

Under the guidance of her statesmen, that great nation had extended her power on all seas. She had found on the globe the space required for the natural growth of her magnitude. Her petty tyrants of to-day, like that of the Fable, are torturing her body either to shorten it to the size of their patriotism or to lengthen it to the measure of their ambitious madness. When ruled by true British statesmanship, England may have excited the jealousy of other nations; she was at least respected, admired and feared. The canker worms of to-day are endeavouring to make her an object of hatred, of derision, of contempt to the world. Refusing to accept the patriotic and clear sighted warning of General Butler, they have been forced to immobilize on the ungrateful soil of Africa the best of her armies and to send her bravest sons to die of fever under the commandment of incapable officers. In the meanwhile, Great Britain was obliged to humble herself under the tutelage of Germany and of the United States, and to become a silent accomplice of the monstrous barbarity of Russian Cossacks, in order that her name should not be totally forgotten in China, where she ruled for half a century under the wise policy of the so-called Little Englanders. If I were the Anglophobe that so many charge me with being, I could not wish for better means to be taken for bringing the downfall of British power. But although some of my words may have fallen hard upon those who look at things from a different standpoint, they should at least have the good faith to admit that my vehemence or my bitterness or even, if they like, my rudeness is not caused by disloyal sentiments nor by racial animosity.

Now, I think my motion should receive the support of all fair-minded men in this House—whether they agree fully or partially with me on the merits of this war,

or on the Imperialistic movement, or whether we differ totally on either of those questions. This resolution does not deal with the causes of the struggle; it does not revive old and irritating controversies; it does not discuss the political consequences of our contribution to the war; it does not treat of Imperial federation or of Canadian independence. It leaves to every one a free hand and an uncompromised position on all those matters. It does not even trace a rigid line of conduct to the British government on the settlement of the war; it simply lays down the principles upon which that settlement should be effected, leaving to the British parliament a full sway of action as to the point where such principles can be carried under actual circumstances. It is simply intended to express the wish of a peace-loving British community, praying that a long and cruel war should be stopped, and that this new century, which has seen the death of a noble and kind-hearted Queen, and the accession of her worthy son, should not be a century of race hatred and struggles in His Majesty's possessions in South Africa. As Canadians, as loyal subjects of the British Crown, we are all interested in the peace of every part of the empire. If peace can be made in South Africa, let peace be. And the only peace that can be made to last must be of such a character to cure the deep wounds inflicted to the heart of the Afrikaners, not only those of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, but those also of Cape Colony and Natal. Such peace is not the brutal and pagan crushing of the vanquished by the conqueror. It is the kind, generous, Christian treatment of the weak by the mighty, the forgiveness of offences suffered so that committed offences may be forgiven.

For the last sixteen months I have been branded, not only in Canada, but throughout the empire, as a disloyal subject, as an ungrateful beneficiary of British favours, as a traitor and a rebel. I have been hissed and hooted in this parliament because I refused to throw ridicule upon the British Crown by celebrating the end of a war which is yet raging; because especially I refused to slander our noble Queen by making her responsible for Mr. Chamberlain's policy. Nine months have passed since we declared that the war was over, and the struggle is fiercer than ever. The death roll gets longer and longer every day; the stream of blood is overflowing; the public exchequer of Great Britain is heavily strained, and we may feel here before long the effect of financial depression in England.

It is no more a war between combatants; it is the beginning of a savage conflict of races. Should even General De Wet and his heroic followers be captured to-morrow, I say the war is not over. The actual fight may be ended, but this is only the first act of the tragedy. For every

Afrikaner homestead burned by order of British commanders, one hundred brands of hatred have been lighted up; they may be covered for some time with the ashes of defeat and repression. But let a blast come from the Orient or the Occident, from the north or from the south—a rebellion in India, a conflict in China, a war in Europe; and, the occasion may not be far away, if jingo rule is to be left a free hand for some time yet in England—and the blaze will again be lighted; and once more shall the decimated compatriots of William the Silent astound the world. Do you want to extinguish that fire for ever, go to those stern, ignorant, fanatical Boers—give them the epithets you like—but make them to understand that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Rhodes, that Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner are not the British people; that behind and above the unscrupulous politicians, the money-grabbers, the brutal soldiers, the bureaucratic martinets with whom they have come in contact for the last ten years, there is a broad, generous nation, upon which they can rely for the safeguarding of their national and individual existence.

'Oh, but Mr. Chamberlain is in power, the empire is safe,' cry out the jingoes; 'let us teach those brigands a lesson they shall never forget.' Take care only that they do not remember it too long; you may pay later on with your own blood the cost of that bloody education.

Yes, Mr. Chamberlain is in power, and the war is not stopped—but Queen Victoria is dead; and the public rumour, and the public conscience, and the public sentiment tell us that her days have been shortened by that disheartening and unglorious war. Up to the day of her death, two thoughts had always kept me lighthearted in the midst of insults and slanders. I knew that I was actuated solely by the pure love of Canada; I felt also that I was in no way responsible for the bloodshed on the veldts of Africa nor for the tears shed in so many Canadian homes. Now a new thought fills my heart with happiness; I am not an accomplice of murderers of the Queen.

I sincerely believe that in urging the House to support this proposition, I am

simply asking the parliament of Canada to respond to one of the last and most heartfelt desires of her late Majesty. I move it as a tribute of homage, of admiration, of love to her memory. It is modest, compared with the magnificent and pompous necrologies that have fallen from the lips of kings and statesmen. But, it is free and sincere; it has not been paid and does not expect to be rewarded by any prize or honour; it is pure of all speculation upon the name of that noble and venerable woman. It is simply the wish of a true Canadian and a true British subject, and in that spirit I move, seconded by Mr. Angers:

That, whilst strictly adhering to the fundamental principle of Canadian autonomy, and refusing to admit that the intervention of Canada in South Africa has committed this country to any future participation in the wars and policy of Great Britain.

This House thinks that the contribution of Canada in the South African war, both in armed help and public expenditure entitles the Canadian people to express an opinion on the matter.

This House, therefore, humbly reminds His Majesty, King Edward VII., that the glorious reign of his august mother, Queen Victoria, whose memory shall ever be cherished by Canadians of all origins and creeds, was inaugurated in bloodshed and rebellion in this part of her dominions; that peace and prosperity were subsequently restored for ever when Her Majesty's advisers understood, as Lord Grey told in his instructions to Lord Elgin, Governor of Canada, that it was 'neither possible nor desirable to carry on the government of any of the British provinces in North America in opposition to the opinions of its inhabitants'; that since that time, Her Majesty has found in no portion of her empire a more faithful, devoted and contented people than her French Canadian subjects.

This House, therefore, expresses the hope and desire that His Majesty's government will endeavour to conclude in South Africa an honourable peace founded upon the law of nations which guarantees independence to all civilized peoples and upon the true British traditions of respect to all national and religious convictions and to the spirit of colonial autonomy.

This House further declares that there is no necessity for sending any more Canadian troops to South Africa, and that the enlistment of recruits for the South African constabulary should not be allowed to take place in Canada.