

Robert Borden submitted the proposal to separate the representation of Canada at Washington from the representation of Great Britain and the other British nations I would have voted against that triumph of iniquity of separating them, even though I had voted alone. So long as I am in parliament I will voice my protest and record my vote against the appropriation of one dollar of Canadian money to maintain the embassy at Washington. I am a Conservative after the fashion of Sir John A. Macdonald's principle: A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die. I have always been opposed to the doctrine of separatism. I notice that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has brought home from the old country a portrait of Sir Robert Borden, painted by that great artist Orpen—not Abe Orpen the Canadian,—but Orpen the artist in the old land. Now while a staunch Conservative I am an independent Conservative as well and am proud to be such, and I will oppose the Conservative party through thick and thin in any tendency it may at any time show towards separation. When I read that this portrait had been presented to the Prime Minister it occurred to me that he ought to hang it in Laurier House, for I know of no one who has done more for the Liberal party than did Sir Robert Borden, Hon. Wesley Rowell, and his Union government. I am sure that if this separation matter had been made an issue in the last election many hon. gentlemen now occupying seats in this House would not be here. If they had taken a stand before the election such as the Prime Minister has taken in regard to our relations with the rest of the empire I have no doubt that many hon. gentlemen would have been defeated. This matter came up for discussion on 21st June last when there was introduced a motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) which at the time I construed as a straight separatist proposal. The motion was introduced by the Prime Minister on June 21 in this House and was debated by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), myself and others. Some of those on this side of the House agree with Sir Robert Borden and Mr. Rowell. I was never a follower of the Union government; I voted for it because I had no option, but the Union government put the Conservative party in the cemetery. I have always opposed separatism and will continue to oppose it in this House so long as I am a member. I would like to repeat a part of the speech I made last June in this connection:

Five hundred thousand soldiers who went to the front and fought for civilization in France and Flanders were satisfied with Canada's status. Fifty thousand of those gallant men lie buried in those countries; they were content to fight even unto death under Canada's status. They fought for Canada's status but did not ask that any change should be made in it; they did not ask for any increased status for Canada. Such being the case I think the civilians who stayed at home should also be satisfied with the status of this Dominion.

Of the links that used to bind Canada to the motherland what links remain to-day? First there is our allegiance to the British crown; secondly there is the right of appeal to the Privy Council; thirdly any treaties into which we enter must have the sanction of the mother of parliaments.

As I said then, we are not an independent nation; we are not a nation at all, but a link in the chain of commonwealths making up the British Empire. There is no feeling in favour of annexation to the United States, and there is no desire to be an independent people. We cannot be independent; we could never stand against the nation to our south. A foreign fleet might sail up the St. Lawrence with not even a rowboat opposing it, while our toy navy is locked up in a garage in Halifax. We should be satisfied to meet with New Zealand and Australia and try to solve the economic problems of the different countries.

I do not believe the people of Canada are at all satisfied with the results of the last conference; nothing practical has resulted from it. It is all very well to talk about the status of Canada, but after all that is a mere academic question. It seems that some people would rather discuss an academic question of that kind than try to solve some of the inter-imperial trade and economic problems concerning this country. I am not at all content with what was done at the conference; if all the results obtained are set out in the speech from the throne, I think the delegates might as well have stayed at home. Where was Mr. Larkin and Canada House when this conference was going on? The representatives of New Zealand and Australia had a brief in a book containing all the economic troubles of their countries. What brief did the representatives of Canada have or work up? None. I would like to see it produced and laid on the table of this House. What material had all those experts of Canada House, London, concerning the economic ills of Canada? In my opinion the High Commissioner's office was not prepared to offer any constructive program to our sister dominions. At the conference Canada preferred to talk about our status and academic questions of that kind, and to sponge on the old country for our maritime freedom