

House of Commons Debates.

FOURTH SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.

SPEECH

OF

H. BOURASSA, M.P.

ON

THE ADDRESS

OTTAWA, WEDNESDAY, 29TH MARCH, 1899

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that you have already heard everything that could be said, and many things that should not be said, on the subject of this debate. I do not hope to add any new feature to it. I am simply giving way to that peculiar instinct of parliamentarians which seems to induce us so strongly, at the opening of every session, to exhale the most obnoxious talking microbes that we have germed and nursed during the eight months of the recess.

Eloquent and dull words have been used during this debate on the actual prosperity of Canada and as to the share of responsibility and of merit which should be attributed to the Government as a factor of good times. At all times and in all lands, rulers are apt to exaggerate their creating and initiating powers. Louis XIV is charged with having said, "L'Etat, c'est moi." In our democratic days, political leaders more modestly say, "I am the Almighty." I must, however, note a signal exception in the hon. member for West Assinibola (Mr. Davin), whose mer'ial energies being altogether of the talkative and sounding sort, more properly says: "I am the Almighty Voice." But if no government can make

the rain fall, the sun shine, the soil produce, and the genius of man move, work, and generate, a good government can, by a sound policy, help natural and even providential causes to have their full effect, and therefore contribute largely to the general welfare of the country.

I am not going to enter into a general appreciation, or even give a simple enumeration of all the works and reforms accomplished by this Government since their advent to power. I will content myself with pointing to one cause which I think has not been mentioned already in this debate—perhaps because our opponents gave birth to it, though it is no credit to them.

For years back the talking and publishing organs of the Conservative party were sounding with lamenting prophecies about all the evils that would befall this country on the day the Liberal party should come to power. No doubt several of those dismal predictions went to the winds, in company, I must admit, with some of our own pathetic appeals to the electors; but nevertheless they created among the trading and manufacturing classes of this community a feeling of uncertainty as to what

would happen in the event of a change of Administration. Nothing, however, in the public platform adopted by the Liberal party warranted such a feeling. The very word "tariff for revenue," coupled with the most rudimentary knowledge of our financial situation, and in the absence of any new form of taxation, meant, in itself, still a large amount of protection to manufacturers.

As to unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, allow me, Sir, to call it, happily, an accident in the political life of both parties—with the difference quite illustrative of the characteristics of both parties, that the Liberals spoke of it openly and frankly at a time when they could do nothing in the matter; whilst the Conservatives, after loud protests of virtue, came very near committing the sin, and certainly went as far as full consent, which, if my theology is right, is equivalent to commission itself. In this matter I would advise the Opposition to imitate the conduct of the laird of Redgauntlet, who wanted to keep the poor Steenie Steenson responsible for a rental already paid to his father; but when Steenie came back from the dark spot and told Sir Robert that he had found the old gentleman there himself, and in a very bad fix, the laird gave him his discharge and begged him to speak no more about it.

But, coming back to the question of tariff reform, I must admit that if it meant not a revolution in the tariff, the mere fact that a readjustment in the customs schedules of the country would take place in case of a change of Administration, created, no doubt, a certain feeling of uneasiness among the industrial classes.

But there were some other causes for that feeling. The scandals that were poisoning the blood of the Conservative party, once healthy and robust; the Manitoba school question, which created a political agitation and kept it up for two years previous to the general elections; several Ministerial crises, taking at the end the hideous appearance of open treason; the dislocation of a huge political structure, once imposing and bearing the character of the powerful men who had built it up—in fact, all actions and all inactions of the Conservative Government, at the end of the last Parliament, were giving to all classes not only the impression, but the deep conviction, that the next general elections would bring a change of Government; that the Conservative party was doomed; and that the Liberals would come to power and have for the first time a chance of applying their financial theories. This may be rhetoric and sentiment; but statesmen and business men who do not take into account moral causes in business matters are no real business men and no real statesmen.

After the general elections were over, after the Liberals had come to power, the Government could not bring down at the first

session their tariff Bill. Therefore, we may fairly state that for two years the manufacturers of Canada limited their importations of raw materials and the wholesale merchants their importations of foreign manufactured articles to the strict figures of actual requirements. But when the tariff of 1897 was brought down; when it was found that the burden of the consumer was lifted to some extent without any injury being done to the producer; when it was found that the policy of the present Government was to seek new markets for our agricultural products without consenting to the slaughtering of our own industrial market—a deep aspiration of hope and relief filled the breast of the nation, and the Canadian people went to work with a feeling of joy and of self-reliance which alone makes peoples and individuals strong, progressive and productive.

If our opponents are so sensitive that they do not like us to say that our coming into power is the cause of the progress of this country, let us say that their going out of power was the cause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. You may think, Sir, that these two propositions belong to that same system of logic which makes such a difference between an unrestricted offer of reciprocity and an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. But I shall venture to explain my statement. I maintain that so long as the Conservative party remained in power; so long as before the trade community of this country, they would have posed as the only economists, as the only men who could create, develop and maintain our national industries; so long as by reason of that, a certain number of traders in this country would have believed, rightly or wrongly, that the coming into power of the Liberals would have meant a change in the tariff—there was a check to the full and free development of the energies of this country.

But now that our tariff policy has been firmly established and proved to be a stable one—not the thing of one party or one class of men, but the property of the people of Canada—there is full confidence that, whoever may be the men in power, the trade and the industries of this country are safe.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I see the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) laughing at my naïveté, but I am just coming to the point which probably brings that smile. It is charged by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Liberals have not fulfilled their pledges, that they are illogical, that they are not sincere, that they are inconsistent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as far as logic is concerned, I will state, at the risk of scandalizing the philosophical mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), that in public affairs,

that in politics, in government, in business, in trade, I do not believe much in logic. Pure logic is one of the most deceiving and dangerous guides of public men.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, it has been the shame and the curse of all weak and decaying governments! It is all very well for theorists to sit quiet in their cabinets and libraries, far from men and from reality, to write splendid articles and books on free trade and protection, inspired by the best of logic and the most profound erudition; but they will not change the climate, the soil, the mines, and all the varied consequences which natural causes impose on human communities. Their philosophical logic will never break the brutal logic of facts. These books may be very useful to the men of action because they may throw light on their actions. But I claim, Sir, that the good governments are those that clothe the people with garments fit to their size and proper to their actual life and work.

Free trade may be a splendid policy for this country in some years to come, and no doubt it will be the duty of the Government of that future day to adopt it—if only for the great pleasure of the descendants of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are so sorry that we do not adopt free trade now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I say, Sir, that the only actual possible policy for this country, and I am not ashamed to say it, is a policy of moderate protection. I am a young politician, I admit, and perhaps if I were as old as the hon. gentlemen opposite I would not give my sincere thought with so much liberty; perhaps I would have such a sufficient knowledge of politics as would prevent me from speaking frankly. I ran in my country as a moderate protectionist; or rather I said to my electors that I did not believe in theories in matters of trade, but that I believed in facts and in figures, and in any Government that would give to my country the policy that was required for the moment, and not the policy that might be required fifty years hence. Let the words and deeds of the Governments of the past speak for themselves—and so far as that is concerned, the hon. gentlemen opposite have more to their debit than to their credit. Let the men of the future make the proper policy for the future of Canada. I have hope enough in my countrymen of any race and of any language to feel sure that when fifty years will have passed upon this country, they will know how to deal with the policy of their days.

But on this very ground of logic, to what school of philosophy belongs the reasoning by which the hon. gentlemen on the other side, who predicted that we would, on coming into power, bring ruin and starvation to

this country, reproach us now that we did not accomplish such ruin and starvation? Do they think the electors will look on it in that way? Much more consistent and much more dignified was the position taken at first by the leader of the Opposition, when he said that the Liberal party had simply put on the shoes of the Conservative party and done nothing of themselves. Of course, that was one of those strong assertions which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has accustomed the House and the country to hear from him, but, at the same time, I repeat it was far more dignified and consistent than the present attitude of the Conservative party. It is another evidence that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is too big for what is left of his party, or that this remnant of the past is too small for him.

Now, as to sincerity. I believe and have always believed that there is a good deal of misapprehension, both in public or in private life, as to what sincerity really is. Of course, if sincerity meant a direct and constant relation between intention and words and actions, very few men indeed, and still fewer political parties, could be called sincere—and I do not think the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House would get the prize. In my humble judgment, sincerity is the direct relation between thought and word, between thought and action at the moment the word is uttered or the action is performed. Under this interpretation, I candidly believe the majority of men to be sincere, either in public or in private life. In politics especially, I see no ultimate gain to be made, no sound public opinion to be created by suspecting, and causing the people to suspect, the sincerity of our public men. There should be enough to criticise and to blame in the actions of all political parties, without attributing low motives to any—unless there is absolute evidence that such motives exist. For my part, I am ready to admit that our opponents are as much animated with a fair spirit of justice and a sincere devotion to the public welfare as we may be ourselves. I want to believe it at least; and if the hon. gentlemen opposite do not talk too much I will continue to believe it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOURASSA. I go a step further, and I say that I quite agree that the Conservatives have done good work for their country in their time—intermingled, of course, as must be in any human community, with misdeeds—though at last a too long use of power made the bad overcome the good until, for the great benefit of the country and for their own, they were sent to the regions of penance, and—

An hon. MEMBER. Oblivion.

Mr. BOURASSA. I forgot, for the moment, the word I was about to use, but anyway the thing is there, and the hon. gentlemen are on the other side of the

House. I meant to use the word "purification," but it will be a long time before they are purified, and so the word will come in just as well next year.

But now supposing we stand the accusation of insincerity, how can we face the charge that we are inconsistent? On this subject again I must confess having a very strong opinion. I believe that consistency is another great danger of public life. I believe that next to the logical, the consistent have been the worst rulers of any country. Of course, I must explain. Consistency in philosophical and moral problems is the only protection for the dignity of the human mind. Consistency in action is most desirable, provided that the cause which gave birth to such action remains unchanged through unvaried circumstances. I have no respect for political men or parties that are not consistent with themselves, that would change their programmes and bend their principles for the sole purpose of catching the capricious wind of public favour. But I have no regard for governments, who, for the petty satisfaction of being told that they are consistent with theories and programmes adopted in years past, would not do the duty of the day. Whatever may have been the varied and isolated opinions of some members of the Liberal party, the general principle of the party in regard to protection and free trade was laid down in 1893. We promised tariff reform, and we have given tariff reform—not, perhaps, to the full extent some of us would have desired, and surely not to the point which hon. gentleman opposite would have liked us to reach, so as to kill ourselves. If in years to come, further reform is needed, I hope and I know that the Government of the day will be equal to the task and will give that reform—provided they are not moved by the crocodile tears of the patriots on the other side exiled from the sweets of office, but by the real touch of the sound public opinion of the country.

It seems to me as if the Opposition was not aware that in a free British country like ours there is a public opinion. There is a great deal of common sense, a spirit of justice, by which our people do not judge politicians so much by their words as by their deeds—and it is probably because they judged our opponents by their deeds that they put them where they are. Of course, they applaud speeches and programmes, but when the time for action comes, they judge men, I repeat, by their deeds.

At least, it is so in my native province, the province of Quebec. And this alone explains the so sudden and so complete changes that have taken place in the political arena of Quebec, both in federal and in local affairs.

This brings me to a statement which I was surprised, and painfully surprised to hear from the lips of a personal friend of mine, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), whom I regard as a broad-minded man. He said the other day :

I fully agree in what the hon. member for Gaspé has said to-night as regards the independence of my province, for the people there are fair-minded, but what I do say is that as long as in the province of Quebec political discussions are carried on by means of such appeals, it will be impossible for us to bring forcibly before the people of that province the real issues between the two parties.

I regret that the hon. gentleman is not here, for I would like to ask him this question: Does he mean to say by these words that when appeals are made to the French Canadians on religious and national grounds they listen to nothing else and can no longer judge of any political question? I do not believe that he means it, because I repeat, he is a fair-minded man. But if he does not mean that, why did he use such words? He should have left that language to his colleague and chief whip the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor),—last year I might have said to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace); but I really believe that since that hon. gentleman has spent a couple of months in Quebec he has so much changed his mind on such subjects that we should not despair of hearing him, in a nice French speech, tell of the loyalty and liberal-mindedness of the French Canadians.

Sir, the province of Quebec is Liberal to-day because she believes that in both Parliaments where she is represented, there are men at the head of affairs who are to be trusted. Times are good, crops have been bountiful, trade is active and the people are merry. And, as everybody knows who has travelled in Quebec, there is no population in the world that can be so easily merry as the true sons of the nation of which its sovereign said: "The people is merry: my Government is safe."

Not that the French Canadians are not interested in politics—quite the contrary. But when they feel that the public chest is in safe hands, they let politics alone and go to work. When they think that a change is needed—and they can make up their minds very quickly, as both parties know by experience—they make the change.

Of course, to say that they are not proud of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would be a great untruth and an insult to their appreciative sense of honour and greatness in men. Like all sincere and sensitive people, they give way to their love and their admiration, not by mere words, but by deeds and by votes. Who can blame them? Surely not the men who came down in the by-elections of the province of Quebec in 1893 and 1894 and asked the people to vote for the candidates of the Conservative Government because Sir John Thompson, the Prime Minister, was a Catholic and the only man to settle the school question.

I admit that in the province of Quebec, or rather, to make it broader, I admit that with the French people more than with the English, the personality of leaders and candidates has to do with the political movements

of the masses. But, Sir, is it not true that in all countries a few men, often one at a time, give direction to public opinion. And when in any country a man arises of whom a whole nation can be proud, it is natural that those who are more closely connected with him are proud of him and say so and prove it. What I deny most emphatically is, that the love and admiration of Quebec for Sir Wilfrid Laurier would make her forget her public duty and her joint responsibility in keeping a sound Government for this country.

Our history is there to be read by all. At one time Louis Joseph Papineau was the idol of the French Canadians. He could move the entire population by the charm of his voice and the power of his magnetism. When after a struggling and unwearied constitutional agitation, his compatriots had obtained their rights as British subjects, they set him aside, and followed the less ideal but more practical policy of Louis Hypolite Lafontaine. They were accused of ungratefulness. But after all, gratitude is not and cannot be a national virtue: races and nations must follow their instinct of self-government.

Another leader came to the front, George Etienne Cartier, and he also, to a less degree, possessed the confidence of his fellow-citizens. But if I know a little of the history of that time, the political fathers of the men who are trying now to raise the Francophone cry did not complain, because, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) pointed out last night, it was the only way for them to retain power. Later on, another leader came whose popularity in Quebec attained very nearly the point which Papineau had reached: that was Honoré Mercier. Like all strong men he had warm friends and bitter foes. No man surely was ever calumniated and misrepresented to such a degree, both inside and outside of his province. The day came when his compatriots listened to his denunciations, and threw him out of office. When the whole truth was known they regretted their sincere but prejudiced movement of indignation, which shows anyhow that, sensitive to a point of injustice when the honour of their province is at stake, they do not hesitate to break their most worshipped idols.

No doubt some hon. gentlemen opposite, disappointed to see the race cry and religious appeals die out all over the land, would be happy to start out a little French domination cry. Not only is such an appeal utterly unfounded and most unjust to the people of Quebec, but it is an insult to the common sense of the English-speaking provinces. I hope the Conservative members coming from those provinces, have more respect for their fellow-citizens than to try and make us believe that their constituents start furiously at even the words of French and Catholic, as wild bulls do at the sight of a red rag.

Giving to the language of the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) its proper wording, I would say:

As long as the Conservative party carries discussion by means of such appeals, it will be impossible for them to induce the people of Canada to trust them back in office.

Sir, as I came up to the Parliament House this morning, I noticed the statues of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier both shrouded with snow. It seemed to me as if the two great leaders, disgusted with the conduct of their party in abandoning its traditions, were hiding their faces as if they wished to return into the tomb.

Coming to the plebiscite, I need not say that the question of bringing in a prohibitory law is settled, and it would be futile and most pretensions to add anything to the straight and impregnable position taken by the Government. But I want to make a few observations on the Quebec anti-prohibition vote. Two causes have been pointed out by some of the prohibitionists as an explanation of that majority, both of them equally untrue and insulting to my native province. One, the worst, has been rather whispered than stated openly, and it is that the vote indicated the marked inferiority of the French people in morality and civilization. I quote the "Camp Fire," organ of the League, number of November last:

The vote that went against prohibition was mainly a French vote. All the Quebec constituencies that voted against prohibition have a very great French-speaking population. Many of them are entirely French. Outside of Quebec a majority of the constituencies that voted against prohibition have large French or German elements.

Then, after an analysis of the vote:

These figures show clearly that a great majority of the English-speaking counties in which reside a great majority of the people of Canada, are overwhelmingly in favour of prohibition. In these days of majority rule, there cannot be any entertainment of the proposition that we should all wait for the legislation we need and desire, until our fellow countrymen from continental Europe are far enough advanced to be fully in accord with the progressive ideas of Saxon civilization.

Does it not sound like an echo of a speech made in the Temple of Jerusalem some two thousand years ago: "I am a just man—not like that pharisee"?

The first of those two paragraphs was reproduced almost literally in two circulars sent around the country, one in December last and the other a few days ago. The second one was wisely skipped over.

I believe in the good faith of the author. But then his only excuse would be his utter ignorance of foreign people, especially of the French, one of the most sober and civilized in the world. I invite that gentleman to take a trip across Quebec and especially through those farming districts where the vote was almost unanimous against prohibition, and if he can find elsewhere a rural population more honest, sober, moral, polite and hospitable I will join his league and

become a temperance preacher, without a moment of weakness. Of course, I should warn him against the good-humoured wit of our old habitants, for, if he presses them too much to join the league he might get the reply that a good Irishman once gave to Cardinal Manning who was urging him to take the pledge. "I took it myself, Pat," said the great archbishop—to which Pat replied with a most respectful wink of the eye: "No doubt your Grace needed it."

The second cause to which the prohibitionists have decided to stick as an explanation of the Quebec majority, is that the vote was fraudulent. This is what I find among the resolutions adopted by the Dominion Alliance at their last meeting:

That we record our profound conviction that the adverse vote on the prohibition plebiscite in Quebec province, as reported, does not correctly represent the sentiment of the electors of the province, but was the result of gross irregularities and frauds in many parts of the province.

Some members on the other side, more virtuous, as usual, than virtue itself, have re-echoed and exaggerated this contention. The member for Compton (Mr. Pope) stated in this House that the majority had grown up from 45,000 to 95,000. Now, what is the use of bringing such accusations when unable to prove them? And this cannot be proved, because it is false. It may be that in some quarters men voted who had no right to do so, but perhaps if we make a thorough inquiry in all the ballot boxes, we may find that those votes are quite evenly balanced. I admit that I did not expect such a vote to be polled in Quebec. The people were not excited over the matter, being unable to understand why they should be deprived of a liberty of which they abused so little. Without going out of my own constituency, I may say that I was absent in Quebec during the whole time of the plebiscite organization and took no part whatever in the matter save in the appointment of the returning officer. Had I been there, it would have been the same. There was quite a prohibition party in Labrador, recruited amongst the best class of people, and most of them my personal and political friends. I would have done nothing to prevent their trying to convince the people. They sent lecturers and canvassers in the most important centres of the county; they organized their representation at the polls. There was no organization whatever on the anti-side. But when the polling day came, people turned out to vote, and figures were: Yes, 546; No, 1,785. Negative majority, 1,239. The whole vote was less than two-thirds of the vote polled at the general elections. The prohibitionists proclaimed that they had no organization in Quebec. Had they had a stronger one they would have simply induced more people to go to the polls and the negative majority would have been still larger.

The explanation is a very simple one. The people of Quebec like to vote, and to vote

the way they like on any question. This is not the first instance where they have shown their independence of opinion, and I hope it is not the last, because that independence is most respectful of vested rights and of outside opinion. They simply do not want what they do not think proper, to be imposed upon them.

I intended closing these remarks by a reference to the Anglo-American Commission. But my connection with that body imposes upon me a special duty of discretion. I think it more proper to wait for the moment when negotiations will be ended one way or the other. May I be permitted, however, to say this much? Whatever may be the immediate and practical results of these negotiations, they will mark an epoch in our history. They are the first indication that, after having achieved our political and commercial independence, we are now in the full practical possession of our international liberty. The first step in that direction was the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties at the request of the Canadian Government. But this had still the appearance of a gift from the mother land to the child colony. In the present instance, the whole thing was left within our hands. Not that I want to deprecate in any way the good work done for Canada by the representative of the Home Government. Far from it; and I consider the sad death of Lord Herschell as heavy a loss to Canada as it is to Great Britain. His very appointment was a great favour and a high compliment to Canada, as well as an acknowledgment of our independence. One of the most eminent jurists of this century, a straight opponent of the present English Administration, and therefore out of political office, the presence of Lord Herschell on the commission meant that the whole political direction of the negotiations was left to the Canadian commissioners, who were given the help of a great legal mind and the moral and constitutional support of Great Britain. And the American commissioners understood it; they saw clearly that in Canadian matters they must deal with the Canadian people, behind which stands the British flag, not as a forced protection to a flock of slaves, but as a free help to free men.

It suffices to go back to the inside history of the Treaty of Washington and compare it with the still incomplete developments of the present negotiations, to appreciate how far we have advanced on the way towards self-control in international affairs. The correspondence of Sir John A. Macdonald, to which the hon. Minister of Public Works referred last night, constitutes a testimony which the hon. gentlemen opposite will, no doubt, readily accept. The great statesman made a gallant fight for Canada; we should all be happy to acknowledge it. But not only did he meet the American stubbornness on his way, but he realized very soon that the British commissioners had decided to bargain the Alabama claims and other Anglo-American trials at the expense of

Canada. He tried uselessly all means, persuasive and threatening. He yielded at last for the sake of Imperial satisfaction. Let it be said, to his credit or to his detriment, according to the point of view taken by oneself: on this, as on some other occasions, Sir John A. Macdonald proved that his devotion to British interests could silence for a moment his Canadian sentiments. But I am not prepared to say, that, under then existing circumstances, he acted wrongly at Washington; and his letters show, at least, that his motives were of the most elevated and statesmanlike nature.

I hope that the negotiations will be resumed and carried to a happy end. In the meantime, it would be fruitless and foolish to start up a jingo cry and raise the feelings of the Canadian people against their neighbours. As I heard once said by Senator Gray, one of the noblest men and broadest in mind that could be met in the great republic or in any other country:

There are always enough of natural and unavoidable differences between two nations. Why create new and artificial ones?

It has been said often that it is most difficult to deal with the American Government. It is quite true, and quite explainable, too, if we go back to the circumstances which gave birth to their constitution—a monument which bears testimony to the high motives and shrewdness of the men who framed it for the thirteen new-born free states—but unmistakably too narrow for the great nation which the shores of two oceans can hardly contain to-day.

I have come back from Washington a greater admirer than ever of the logical but so broad and so humane British constitution—and, I must add, a greater admirer than before of the American people; a larger gathering of free men, intelligent, progressive, sincere, quick and broad, both in mind and in action, never existed under the sun. Let us rely upon the better feelings and keen judgment of the best, if not the most numerous class of Americans. Let us stand in a cool, dignified, unprovoking attitude. And if John Bull and Brother Jonathan meditate some good bargains in partnership, somewhere else in the world, they will soon understand each other as to Canadian affairs. Many think that the new friends may find the pieces too small for an equal division, but others add that they may meet on their way some other concerns too big for either one of them. This is a pretty safe guarantee of friendship. And then—there is no use of denying it—the Anglo-Saxon feeling is there. It had been dormant for years; it may go asleep again; but for the time being it is awake—not perhaps to the point indicated by the most enthusiastic statesmen and journalists of both countries, but beyond what I expected to find there myself. I was never so much impressed as during my late stay in the United States, with the truth of the proverb, "Blood is thicker than water."

Of course, I am too much of a Frenchman to call for an Anglo-American alliance all over the world; but I am enough of a Canadian and of a Britisher in Canada to desire its accomplishment as far as Canadian interests are at stake.