OTTAWA LETTERS.

An Excellent Speech by Mr. McInerney of Kent, N. B.

Charlton the Present Loyalist Versus the Charlton of Commercial Union Notoriety.

Mr. Chauvin, of Terrebonne Shows How the French Had Been Deceived With Regard to the War in South Africa.

OTTAWA, Feb. 15.—In yesterday's letter there was not space to mention all the interesting points in the discussion concerning the vote for South Africa. No mention was made of Mr. Charlton, who spoke for an hour in strong approval of the course of the British government and in vindication of the support of Canada to the war. These are great days, when such speeches come from Mr. Charlton, formerly United States envoy extraordinary in Canada, and at one time ambassador for the Canadian opposition at Washington, where he acted as assistant to Mr. Wiman and other enemies of Canada in pointing out the weak positions of this country and instructing our enemies where to attack us. The time has come when the electors of Norfolk will not stand any more of this sort of thing. Mr. Charlton has become more loyal than the loyalists. He gives pointers to Mr. McNeill. He accuses the Imperial Federation League of want of imperial patriotism. He offers the last Canadian man and the last Canadian dollar to British wars, wherever they are. The enthusiasm with which Mr. Charlton endorses Great Britain's policy in Africa is only equalled by the energy with which he advocated his seduction bill. For a long life time Mr. Charlton has fought and bled in opposition to the imperial policy which the people of Canada support. He has now reached the age of consent. Moreover, Mr. Charlton has built a saw mill in Ontario and doesn't care how much the Canadian government forbids the export of logs to his mills in Michigan. John Charlton of Michigan, as he appeared a few years ago in the United States records, is dead, Now he is John Charlton of the British empire.

Mr. Bourassa is a bright young man, inclined to be spectacular. He has been talking rather large, but it is now discovered that he is not dangerous to the government. Mr. Bourassa would not harm a fly, if the fly occupied a ministerial seat in the house of commons. When he rose to put in his protest against the Canadian contribution to the war in Africa, it was expected that he would oppose it, and, in fact, he gave reasons apparently satisfactory to himself why it should be so. Hs insisted that this African affair was only the beginning of sorrow and that this precedent implied our contributing to every British war from this time forward. Even if the British were right in their African policy, Mr. Bourassa held that it would be no affair of Canada. He was able to sustain that contention by a quotation from his leader, but then he thinks the British are wrong. He accuses Chamberlain of violating treaties. He says the French Canadians "have an admiration and a sympathy for a small nation struggling for independence." He praises Paul Kruger. He states that the Burghers have not discriminated against the Outlanders. He declares that the taxation paid by the miner is never more than 12 pounds sterling for one man, which he says is not high. He says that the Dutch population in the Transvaal "despise gold, despise diamonds and want to lead a pastoral life, like the first settlers of all countries, the first settlers of New France and of New England." He maintains that Chamberlain revived the claim of suzerainty after it had been abolished, abandoned solemnly, and concluded by declaring that the war was unjust.

Mr. Bourassa is kind enough not to blame the Canadian voluteers, "poor brave, straightforward boys." He said, "if they only knew the secret motive and reason that were underlying this war they would be more indignant than they are." He points out that even the small amount of 25 cents a day, which is to be paid to our men in Africa, will amount to $180,000 a year, and if we send 10,000 men, it will be $900,000 a year, and "should we send 100,000 men, as General Hutton decided we shall send in the next war, it will mean $9,000,000 more."

But the absurd conclusion which Mr. Bourassa reached after all his declarations was that he would support the whole bill except one clause. So it is evident that Mr. Bourassa is not serious and that his understanding with Mr. Tarte covers the whole case. He is making the same speech that Mr. Tarte would make if he had not assumed the responsibility for the action of his colleagues, as he had to do or else get out of the government.

Mr. Craig spoke strongly in support of the action of the government and declared that as one opposition member he would have been glad if Canada had agreed to pay the whole cost of her contingent. He does not join Mr. Bourassa in his expression of pity for those Canadians who have gone to the war without understanding the reason of it. So far as he knew the volunteers knew very well what they were about. They were intelligent men and had gone to Africa of their own free will. Nobody asked any man to go. The men had not only offered to go, but had begged for the privilege of going. For his part he had no regrets to express in the matter, neither had they. He reminded Mr. Bourassa that all his talk about the injustice of Britain making war upon the Transvaal ignored the fact that England had not yet put a foot on the Transvaal, and that the war was made on British territory by the Boers, in whose behalf Mr. Bourassa had spoken.

As was stated yesterday Mr. Monet made a much stronger impression than Mr. Bourassa. He is evidently a serious man, with a strong feeling of independence, and this is shown by the fact that he is accused of disloyalty to his party, while Mr. Bourassa is not. On this point Mr. Monet offered a remark: "I have been charged with disloyalty," he said. Solicitor General Fitzpatrick, sitting before him, said: "It is true." Mr. Monet turned to the solicitor general, sharply remarking "he should remember that "I am not the only man from the "province of Quebec who has been "charged with being a traitor to his "party, and if he does not know his "own history perhaps later on we "can give him a little of it." This is a reminder of an occasion when Mr. Fitzpatrick turned against his leaders and proved to be a vigorous, if not a sustained party rebel.

Mr. Monet is not convinced by Mr. Tarte's statement that the course adopted is no precedent. He knows that it is a precedent and declares that so far as England is concerned it was intended to be one. Assuming it to be so, Canada is engaged in the future to participate in England's wars. He figures out that England has had 32 wars in the last fifty years and is likely to have the same number in the next half century. On this point he agrees with the statement made by Mr. Tarte, to which Mr. Tarte says he still adheres, only Mr. Monet votes as he thinks, while Mr. Tarte votes as he is obliged.

It is interesting to give a few of the quotations read by Mr. Monet as expressions of public opinion at the time that the first contingent was offered. Le Temps, which is a government paper in this city, spoke with favor of Mr. Tarte, "who opposes the ridiculous idea of taking our money to carry on imperial wars." Le Temps added: "Is is not plain that Great Britain, seeing the storm that is about to burst over her head, seeks to engage us in a conflict created or provoked by her," and it went on to say that if Britain asked for Canadian help "such an audacious and unusual proceeding would be a new reason for distrust of her." Mr. Monet then quoted La Patrie, the principal French daily supporting the government in Quebec province. La Patrie declared that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had "very clearly defined the government's position in stating that there was no justification whatever for the government offering or sending a contingent without previously consulting parliament." And La Patrie added that if the Laurier government "had taken upon itself the responsibility of sending a military contingent to the Transvaal at the expense of this country we should have blamed its policy." Le Soleil, which is the liberal organ in Quebec city, was quoted by Mr. Monet. The Soleil, when it was called Le Electeur, having the same editor and proprietor, said: "Why would we fight for England? Your sons will be sent to Africa and Asia, from whence they will never come back." Mr. Monet went on to quote the Sentirel Review, Toronto Sun, the Huntingdon Gleaner, Montreal Herald, and then turned his attention to a few members of parliament.

Mr. Fortin, liberal member of Laval, said at a public meeting "one contingent, well, let it go, but don't do it again, because if you do I will most likely oppose it." Mr. Ethier, another liberal member, said "the first contingent, all right—no, not all right; but it will do, if you don't do it again." Mr. Demerais, one of the Montreal members supporting the government, said at a meeting in his own city: "The Laurier government would be seriously blamed by the electors if it approved of a measure sending a Canadian contingent to the Transvaal, and I, for one, would rise on the floor of the house as a member for St. James division if such a proposal were brought before parliament, and signify my disapproval."

Mr. Monet wanted to know in view of these quotations and those which he could make from the Toronto Globe and other papers, and from members of parliament, what was the public opinion, and where was it expressed to which Sir Wilfrid referred when he explained that he was acting in accord with public opinion. Mr. Monet is afraid that it is conservative opinion and the conservative press, which has forced Sir Wilfrid in the direction he has gone. Sir Wilfrid tried at first to withstand that opinion, but had finally given away to it. Mr. Monet does not think Sir Wilfrid should have yielded to the demand of the conservative leader, and the conservative press, especially as the premier calls the latter "a reptile press." He says: "If it is a reptile press I wonder "if this reptile has had something to "do with the policy that has been pursued. I do not say that the reptile "has crossed the threshold of the "council board to present the apple "of temptation. I do not say that "the cabinet took the whole apple, but "they took half of it, and the balances is still in litigation between the "liberal and conservative parties."

The effect of Mr. Monet's speech has been to produce strained relations between him and his leaders and colleagues. Strong words have passed among them, and Mr. Monet so far resented the language that he refused to attend the caucus yesterday, and may now be regarded as a recalcitrant. Yet Mr. Monet is expressing exactly the same opinion that was expressed by Sir Wilfred Laurier and Mr. Tarte in October. They are the same opinions that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Tarte tried to impose upon the country. The leaders have failed and have given it up. Mr. Monet does not think that he ought to give it up. He believes he is right, even though public opinion may be against him. He does not see that a minister has the right to do what he believes to be wrong, and what he has declared to be wrong, and what he has asserted that he will not do, even though a certain popularity may be acquired by such action. His argument was in favor of action upon principle and not expediency. He does not believe in the loyalty to England that admits itself to be unwilling loyalty. That is Mr. Monet's position, and if it condemns his own leaders more strongly than it condemns the opposition leaders, it is the fault of his own leaders. For Mr. Monet does not question the sincerity and straightforwardness of the conservatives, who have always taken the position that the government does now. But he does reflect upon the honor and motives of those leaders, who have strongly taken one position and abandoned it because they found it to be unpopular and unprofitable.

Yesterday's session was given up mostly to questioning and to a discussion of the grain transportation question chiefly as affecting Montreal and the lake ports. The question was raised by Mr. Bennett of Simcoe, who has an important lake port in his constituency. Mr. Tarte made a speech which was full of vague generalities and did not arrive at anything. The house sat for less than three hours.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, Feb. 16.—The afternoon proceedings in the chamber yesterday did not excite very large interest, not half so much as an affair downstairs at the senate end in the evening. There Sir Charles Tupper entertained some three score of his supporters in both chambers, and a few friends who are not yet in parliament. It was a pleasant gathering, enlivened with a few speeches and some songs, and terminating in the small hours after midnight. Sir Charles had at his right Sir Adolphe Caron and Senator Miller, and on his left the premier of the Northwest and Col. Tisdale, while two other ex-ministers, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper and Col. Prior were at the other end of the two tables.

Col. Prior, in proposing the health of the host, made particular mention of Sir Charles Tupper's recent tour in the west, and of the revival and prospective triumph of the conservative cause in his own province. He spoke of the great vigor displayed by the leader in his western tour, as showing a remarkable physical endurance for a man of his age.

Sir Charles, in responding, rather deprecated the allusion to his years. He would not know that he was an old man, he said, if he were not so frequently reminded of it by these references to his strength and endurance. Perhaps, however, it was necessary to suggest to him on such pleasant occasions as this the fact that he was reaching an advanced age, otherwise he might indulge in some juvenile freaks which might be thought unbecoming in an elderly man. As to his western trip and his campaign tours through the provinces, there was really nothing in them to make a man weary. On the contrary, he met so many friends, had such a kindly reception and received so much encouraging evidence of the success of the principles and the party with which he is connected, and found the western air so agreeable and the scenery so delightful, that he returned greatly rejuvenated. In fact, the campaign of last autumn, with such party successes as had come during the period, had almost made him find his lost youth again. Sir Charles had no word of disrespect to say of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's party, which was not present to speak for itself, but he ventured to appeal to his friends here to say whether they had not noticed a considerable change in the frame of mind on the other side of the house. Three years ago the government members were exceedingly proud and lifted up, and perfectly confident in their ability to do everything. Their spirits had greatly fallen and their mood had become not triumphant but apologetic. Sir Charles had some amusement at the expense of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who has yielded to public sentiment against his own expressed opinion, though the public sentiment found expression from conservative lips and the conservative press, as Mr. Monet had stated in the house. Here at least was an admission of the premier that though he reigned he did not govern. The fact is, said Sir Charles, our party has been out of office but never quite out of power. In closing, Sir Charles said he thought that the liberal conservatives should congratulate themselves on the fact than any little differences which formerly existed had been swept away and they were now a united party, strong in the courage of their opinions and in their confidence for the future. For himself he would be rejoiced to see the party once more in power, and should that hour arrive in the near future, as he thought it would, he would be willing to sing his nunc dimittis.

Premier Haultain of the Northwest is a young and modest man, but Sir Chas. Hibbert says that he is a power in that country. He himself pronounces the Northwest to be altogether favorable to the conservative party, and pays his tribute to the services performed by the leader in his meetings there last year. Mr. Haultain travelled with Sir Charles, speaking at half a dozen meetings, and at the end was obliged to go home, as he was not physically able to keep up the pace. He had delivered Sir Charles over to his British Columbia friends, Sir Charles Hibbert and Col. Prior, and he understood from them that at the end of the British Columbia tour, which involved long and continuous travelling, they were both knocked out.

Sir Adolphe Caron, who has returned to Canada after nearly two years' sojourn abroad, expressed his pleasure to be once more among his friends, and to assist in the Canadian campaign. He testified to the comradeship and public spirit, national and party loyalty, of the French-Canadian people, and hoped that any misapprehension which may have been created from want of knowledge and association with them would gradually wear away, on a larger acquaintance.

Ex-Speaker White drew some interesting comparisons between the present situation and that which existed previous to the election of 1878. He had then come into parliament for the first time, and, looking at it now from the outside, he saw that the same fight was being made, working up to the same result. As one of the great electorate which makes governments, he expressed the opinion that the time of Sir Wilfrid's departure was at hand.

Sir Charles Hibbert humorously described his own difficulties in keeping the pace with his father in campaigning, and observed that while it was an excellent thing to see an old man capable of performing so much, he thought there was a lesson in it for the younger men like himself to do their part in the struggle. Sir Charles Hibbert finds that since the Manitoba elections a great change has come over the attitude of the parties in the west. Hundreds and thousands of men who have been keeping in their holes for two or three years now come out and declare themselves to be conservatives. Whereas three years ago it was almost unsafe for a traveller in a western train to say he was a conservative, you could hardly find a man now who is anything else.

Dr. Roddick of Montreal explained that Sir Charles Tupper was not an old man, as age went. He was an optimist and lived a regular life, and he (the doctor) saw no reason why for many years yet Sir Charles might not be a prominent public man.

After an eloquent speech by Sir James Grant and the observations of Col. Tisdale and others, with some singing, Mr. Dalby, the organizer, put in a plea for himself. Mr. Dalby says that the constitution does not provide for a poet laureate. He applied for the job when the office is created, and produced a specimen poem, suggested by the fact that Dr. Borden had sent the troops away with 400 extra tunics that were not required, and without 400 pairs of trousers that were needed. Here is the poem:

THE CHARGE OF THE LIGHT (CLAD) BRIGADE.

The bravest palled when he was told
That somebody had blundered;
And the corps' supply of pantaloons
Was minus just four hundred.

Our hearts are brave, and yet we grieve
At prudence so neglected;
They send us to the front and leave
Our rear quite unprotected.

We marched for many a weary mile,
In a costume light and airy;
A little in the classic style
Of Grecian statuary.

Of course we met some very hard,
Some trying situations;
It took us all the time to guard
Our base of operations.

Our sufferings would be less keen,
Were there any chance of getting
A box or two of vaseline
And some mosquito netting.

We've scissors and needles and cottons and pins;
But nowhere to put the patches.
We've pipes and tobacco and those sort of things;
And nowhere to strike our matches.

This thing is getting monotonous,
And we long for the sake of variety
To tuck our shirts into divided skirts,
As they do in polite society.

Our statesmen talk of glory, why,
We've no heart for glory now, sirs;
We'll talk of medals bye and bye,
Just now we want our trousers.

We long to meet the foeman's steel,
To hear the welcome rally
"Come on ye Royal Sans-Culottes;
Charge Borden's corps de ballet."

And when the batteries unmask,
O'erhead the iron hail screeches;
Then all we ask, "Give us the task
To storm Pretoria's breeches."

Mr. Borden of Halifax will have to make a fight to get ahead with his Brockville and West Huron ballot box stuffing investigation. He has been headed off by a point of order which was not taken on previous occasions of a like kind. The action was taken at the request of the government. Sir Louis Davies and Mr. Fitzpatrick at first intended to raise the objection. Whether Mr. McMullen got ahead of the ministers, or whether they engaged him to do the job, does not fully appear. But they have succeeded in standing the thing over for a few days, and it is feared that they will find some method of blocking it altogether. The discoveries of last year in regard to the West Huron ballots produced a painful impression on the country, and this has been strengthened by the investigation into the Ontario election, and by the mysterious burning of the West Elgin ballots. The same machine operated in the local and dominion elections, and it seems to have operated in much the same manner. The Brockville ballots cannot well be burned, but it may be possible for a government, backed by a majority in the house, to keep them out of sight. Meanwhile Mr. Holmes and Mr. Comstock, who have been declared elected in Brockville and West Huron, will be able to sit in the chamber and vote against an investigation into the method of their own election.

S. D. S.

OTTAWA, Feb. 17.—The second day's discussion on the contingents closed without a vote and there are still several members who desire to make observations. It will be seen that the short time given to the debate on the address is already partly atoned for in this discussion. Members are saying now what they would have said less appropriately at the opening of the house. It fell upon Mr. Davin to be the first to speak after the two dissentients from Quebec, but before giving attention to them Mr. Davin had a little fun with Mr. Charlton, whose exuberant imperialism has astounded both sides of the house and has greatly annoyed some of the gentlemen that sit on the same side as Mr. Charlton. Mr. Davin recalled speeches of Mr. Charlton in favor of the continent to which he belonged and against closer connection with England and the empire. There were scores of these speeches, amounting to probably several weeks' continuous speaking and covering some acres of Hansard. After many years of this sort of campaign Mr. Charlton makes a recantation, a deathbed confession so to speak. Only Mr. Davin hopes that Mr. Charlton has many years of a better life before him to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. He points out that Mr. Charlton, with all the enthusiasm of a new convert, flings himself at the head of the procession and immediately sets out to take charge of the whole revival.

Mr. Davin finds that Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monet are not opposing Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They are only supporting the Laurier of October 3rd against the Laurier of October 14th. Mr. Bourassa recently stood as a candidate on behalf of the Senior Laurier after the Junior had taken his place, and he still is in accord with the other minister who introduced him, and who says that he still holds to the old opinion, while he admits the responsibility for the new and opposite one. Mr. Davin holds to the theory of responsible government which assumes that ministers are agreed in their policy, and that a minister who disagrees ought to resign. A divided cabinet is an irresponsible cabinet. As for Mr. Monet, he distinctly sets forth the views that this dominion is not to remain British. He goes in for separation, and the important feature of his case is that he truly says he learned his doctrine from Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself.

Mr. Davin made rather short work of Laurier's view that it was not the business of the government to lead the people, but to ascertain public opinion and follow it. This was an absolute declaration that a government had no business with convictions. The right idea was that a government was composed of individuals with fixed policy, in which they agreed and which they endeavored to work out. If the people supported that policy the government remained in power. If the people preferred another policy it was not supposed that the ministers would abandon their own convictions and take up the new line, but that they should adhere to their convictions and allow the people to replace them with another government holding different views. According to the premier's view, brigand after brigand might lead the government, and men with conscience and conviction would have no chance.

But then Sir Wilfrid did try to lead the people. He had convictions on the 1st October, and very strong ones, the only strong ones that he ever expressed since he became premier. He did try to lead the people in a certain direction. When the attempt failed he went with the people in the opposite direction. The people treated the premier's views with contempt, but not with more contempt than the premier himself had shown for them, nor with more contempt than they deserved. Mr. Davin reminded the government of a statement made by Mr. Monet, who said that there was very little enthusiasm in Quebec, Sir Wilfrid's constituency, over the departure of the volunteers. Mr. Monet explained that by an anecdote, the point of which was that the enthusiasm was missing because "the premier does not want it." That is to say, while the premier professed to be anxious to contribute to the defence of Africa, he was quietly discouraging enthusiasm among his own people.

Mr. Ross Robertson, who, by the way, was elected in opposition to the candidate of the late government, and is an independent conservative, made his speech in four sentences. Sir Wilfrid came back from the jubilee boasting that he had made Canada a nation. If Canada is a nation, why does she not pay her way like a nation? Why should she, like the Hessian Princess, send her troops to serve abroad in the pay of other people? If Mr. Robertson has his way Canada will yet obtain a statement of account and pay the whole bill, but he says that the present government must close the case up pretty soon or they will not be here to do it at all.

Mr. Oliver, from the Northwest, a government supporter with independent leanings, holds that 50 cents a day is not enough to pay the men who are going to Africa. It is not proper to compare that rate with the imperial rate of pay. For our men are not professional soldiers, but have given up their occupations, and some have sold their farms to go on this service. They have no long military career before them, will belong to no army service and will not be entitled to pensions. It is true they do not fight for pay, but they should not be allowed to make the whole sacrifice.

When Mr. Charlton stigmatized the members of the imperial parliament who voted for the Redmond resolution as "cravens actuated by treasonable motives," it is supposed that he had Mr. Blake in mind. There was a time when Mr. Charlton was a red hot continental politician, a leader in the Commercian Union movement. At that time Mr. Blake withdrew from the party because Mr. Charlton and his colleagues were leading a campaign which meant treason to England. Now it is Mr. Charlton's turn, and he calls Mr. Blake a coward and a traitor. But Mr. Stenson, the grit member for Richmond and Wolfe, who was born in Ireland, is furious about it. That is, he is furious because Mr. Charlton calls the Redmondites "cravens." It does not worry Mr. Stenson in the least that he calls them traitors, for he never mentioned that part of the allegation. But Mr. Stenson read some of Tom Moore's indignant declamation against the insulters of Ireland and assured Mr. Charlton that if he had read the history of England and Ireland as lovingly as he had read that of the United States he would have been more sparing in his insults.

A very excellent speech was made by Mr. McInerney, who happens to be in the same position as Mr. Stenson, in that he is likewise of Irish descent and represents a majority of French-speaking people. Mr. McInerney has no hesitation in endorsing the proposition to contribute to the defence of the empire and is quite certain that the people of Kent are with him to a man. He would have been glad if the government had relieved Great Britain of the whole expense of the expedition. As to the charge against Mr. Blake, who, according to Mr. Stenson, was one of the great lights of this parliament, Mr. McInerney ventured to differ from him as to the wisdom of his recent actions. He thought that in view of the desire shown by a large number of people in England and Scotland to give Ireland home rule, this would have been a fine opportunity for the Irish representatives to come to the support of the empire, which was now fighting the cause of liberty and of right. For himself, he is an imperialist and in favor of local home rule, and heart and soul in sympathy with the British cause in Africa. Mr. McInerney knows the history of French Canada and finds in it two schools of thought. One school, represented by Cartier, Chapleau, Caron, Chapais, Langevin and others has been strongly in favor of the British connection and of development within the empire. The other, led in times past by Dorions, Mercier, Beaugrand, and some years ago by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, had other views. It was from that school that Mr. Monet and Mr. Bourassa drew their inspiration. If there were people in French Canada not in sympathy with the contribution to the defence of the empire, it was because this school of politicians had taught them wrong. His advice was that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends should at once go among these people and undo the wrong that had been done, show them that the British empire was their best friend, point out to them that under no other rule would they be so secure in the maintenance of all that they held dear, and that it was their interest and their duty alike to support the empire in all her struggles against oppression and wrong the world over.

Mr. Bell of Pictou is in a complimentary mood. Whatever might be said of the past, a stage has been reached in which only two members out of 213 had a word to say against this resolution. The government side was in action as least nearly unanimous, and the opposition was wholly so. After commending the militia officers and the government for the energy which it displayed in organizing the contingent, Mr. Bell expressed the opinion that there was no serious disloyalty in Canada. There was more loyalty than even in the mother country, where they were not all of one mind, or in the United States at the time of the civil war, when there were copperheads. He was not disposed to indulge in recriminations, but would rather congratulate the country on what had been accomplished.

Mr. Chauvin, one of the few French conservatives in the house, who succeeds Mr. Chapleau as member for Terrebonne, spoke in his own language. He referred to a meeting that took place at St. Jerome, where resolutions were adopted apparently hostile to imperial action. Mr. Chauvin explained that the French Canadians were not opposed to the war, nor averse to assisting, but they had been falsely told that they were being dragged into the wars of the empire. Sir George Cartier had given his pledge at the time of confederation that they would not be forced against their will to fight in other lands. They were now being deceived by the statements that this pledge had been broken. As a matter of fact, the French Canadians were ready to do anything to help the mother country, and if the number of volunteers of his race seemed to be small, he reminded the house that a large number of the English speaking volunteers were not native Canadians, but men from the mother country who had lived there. He thought that a fair proportion of the native Canadians who had volunteered were of French origin.

Mr. Clarke of Toronto made a forcible speech, expressing deep regret that our government had not responded at once to public feeling and thus place Canada at the head of the procession instead of at the tail. The premier had waited for three months after other colonies offered assistance, and to the last moment he did all he could to resist public opinion. Public opinion had in the end been too much for him, but it was so long a fight that Canada was the last colony to offer assistance and the only one which did not make a public proposition to the home government until it had been approached by Mr. Chamberlain. Up to that time the offers for service had been those of individuals. The government could not prevent these private offers, and in that way Mr. Chamberlain had an opportunity to appeal to Canada and lay down the plan of action. Even then the ministers had apologized for the course they took and had declared through their press in Quebec that they had offered no assistance, but had merely responded to an imperial demand and had permitted those Canadians to go who had offered their services. Mr. Clarke rejoices that so much had been accomplished in spite of so much official obstruction, but he assures the house that not only in Toronto, but all over the country, would the people have been better satisfied if Canada, among the first of the colonies, had offered to organize a corps, equip, transport and pay the men during the whole time of their service. Mr. Bell of Prince Edward Island, who was the last speaker, gave as the reason for taking the floor the explanation that if he did not speak the attitude of P. E. I. might be misunderstood. Having thus shown his scant confidence and that of his province in the minister of marine, Mr. Bell discussed at considerable length and with obvious profundity, the various problems that present themselves in the Transvaal.

S. D. S.

Happiness consists in being perfectly satisfied with what we have got and with what we haven't got.

Foul Breath from Catarrh

Tells of the Decay of the Mucous Lining of the Nose and Throat.

No symptom of catarrh causes more annoyance than foul breath. This offensive odor comes from ulceration of the membranes and is an indication of the decay which is taking place in the linings of the nose and throat. To the victim of catarrh as well as to his associates, this foulness of the breath is disgusting.

To counteract bad breath and to eradicate catarrh from the system no treatment is more successful than Dr. Chase's Catarrh Cure, the only remedy that can be relied upon to entirely cure chronic catarrh.

Dr. Chase's Catarrh Cure is sent direct to the diseased parts by the improved blower which accompanies each box, heals the ulcers, clears, the air passages, relieves the pressure which causes headache, stops the decay which causes four breath, and absolutely cures catarrh and prevents consumption. 25c. a box, blower free, at all dealers, or Edmanson, Bates & Co., Toronto.

CASTORIA

For Infants and Children.

The fac-simile signature of Chas. H. Fletcher. is on every wrapper.