

Who would expect for a moment that the hon. gentleman who uttered these words:

I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of—

What?

—the United States of America.

Who would ever accuse any gentleman uttering those expressions of being an imperialist? So, I say that his expression the other day on the second reading of the Bill was entirely superfluous. Again:

The present position of Canada cannot last for ever. Even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place.

If the right hon. gentleman had stated that he was a separatist, it would have more nearly conformed to his past utterances on this subject. But, to say: I am not an imperialist, was superfluous. Again:

It is a great mistake, a fundamental mistake, to make allegiance, British allegiance—

With the emphasis on the British.

—the basis of trade.

Yet we have the right hon. gentleman's supporters rising in parliament and telling us: we gave a preference to the motherland and to-day we are enjoying a sentimental preference in her market, but notwithstanding that we should not make allegiance the basis of trade, especially British allegiance. Again said the premier:

I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation, in the course of time.

No man in this or any other country would have to state that these words were not likely to emanate from an imperialist.

I notice that the member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), referring to and reflecting on the member for Jacques Cartier today for his utterances in regard to British diplomacy, had not one word of condemnation to offer to his own leader for giving voice to similar or even stronger expressions. I am not here to defend the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I will frankly say that in this regard I do not agree with him. Will the hon. member for Pictou and other gentlemen opposite be equally frank and say that they condemn the Prime Minister's statements? What the hon. gentleman stated is reported in 'Hansard' of April 7, 1892. Speaking about the making of treaties, and referring to the present hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), he said:

Mr. ROCHE.

The hon. gentleman has told us in a casual way, however, that if we adopted the power which is now claimed, we would be relieved of the services of British diplomacy.

This is his answer:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy? What has been British diplomacy to us, Sir. British diplomacy, so far as Canada is concerned, has been a record of failure, and of surrender and sacrifice.

And the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), apparently, is approving of his leader's course while condemning hon. gentlemen on this side for statements very much milder in effect.

Now, it may be stated that the speech delivered in Boston was delivered at a time prior to an election in this country. That is true. But it was repeated in effect after that election was over, after the defeat of the Liberal party at the polls, when the present Prime Minister had plenty of time to weigh his words and the effect of them upon himself, his party and his country. Yet he rose in this House and repeated the declarations and absolutely gloried in them. And I state that, up to the present time, these expressions have never been repudiated or retracted. The hon. member for Pictou began his speech the other evening with a reflection upon a past leader of the Conservative party as being an annexationist. He had not the manliness to state whom he had in mind. Had he stated the name, then we should have known that the gentleman referred to was one who, as a young man and, long prior to his entering upon public life, had signed an annexation manifesto at a time when the relations between Canada and Downing Street were most strained and when there was great irritation in this country. Had the hon. member for Pictou desired to be fair, he would have gone on to tell us that, in another chamber of this parliament, that gentleman, after becoming a leader in public life, had risen in his place and frankly confessed his error, and stated that he and others had acted 'like a lot of angry school children,' but that he thought his life since then had surely more than counteracted that youthful indiscretion. Sir, the people of Canada can honour a man like that, who can acknowledge a fault. But the Prime Minister has never retracted his words. And we have a right to say that he could not retract them, because they express his sentiments to-day. He had it put up to him by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other night: 'Are these your sentiments still, Sir?' And, by his silence, the Prime Minister gave assent. Why are we accused and attacked by hon. gentlemen on the other side when we recall to the attention