

Macdonald) was entirely erroneous when he said that Mr. Balfour had never admitted there was a German scare.

I can quite well understand why the creation of an independent Canadian navy would be welcomed by those who look forward to the independence of Canada as our future national destiny, for I recognize that in order to maintain a separate national existence a considerable navy would be absolutely necessary. But I deny that there is any large sentiment in Canada in favour of Canadian independence, notwithstanding the fact that some of the right hon. gentleman's supporters, from at least one province in this Dominion, are sedulously cultivating that idea among their followers and are using that as an argument to induce the people to support the government's proposition. Canada is to-day enjoying as great an amount of autonomy as is consistent with its remaining an integral part of the British empire, and I feel that the consensus of opinion and desire in this country, far from being that as the right hon. gentleman said a few years ago, we would in the process of time drift away from the motherland as the ripe fruit falls from the parent tree, is that the overseas dominions and Great Britain will be drawn more closely together in fact as well as in name, under one sovereign, one flag, one navy, each component part having a reasonable voice at least in matters pertaining to the defence of the empire. The history of the Canadian confederation is a notable example of the benefit to be derived from union. The history of the Australian Commonwealth is another and the latest example within the British empire is the confederation of South Africa. In my judgment the time is not far distant when all the overseas dominions and the motherland will be drawn together and confederated for many purposes and to a great extent, each one having an equal say in all important matters in the councils of the empire. Sir, if the actions of the Prime Minister in regard to the future destiny of our country is being viewed with considerable amount of distrust by the people of Canada, he has only himself to blame and well he knows it. The people of this country have not forgotten his past utterances in regard to Canadian independence. They have not forgotten that celebrated Boston speech of his, paragraphs of which have been quoted. I shall quote another paragraph lest we forget. The right hon. gentleman after he became leader of the Liberal party visited Boston and before a great audience gave voice to the following utterance:

In my opinion the conduct of England, of Canada, towards the United States during the war was a disgrace to the civilization of

England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles; they required no help, but when they were engaged in a supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation; when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy, as ever engaged the devotion of men; when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England, with the passive connivance of the British government, to destroy American commerce on the high seas; it was galling that rebel refugees could find shelter in Canada, and there, with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession.

This was greeted with applause. Here we have the Prime Minister of Canada, at that time the leader of a great political party, visiting a foreign country and before that large audience, true to his instincts and desire to say something to tickle the ear of the particular audience that happened to be present, holding up to the execration of that foreign audience, old England, the motherland, and Canada, the land of his birth, for which he claims to have such an affection to-day. He says this, forgetful of the fact that in that very same life and death struggle of the civil war, there were admittedly not less than 40,000 Canadian citizens engaged and enrolled in the American army fighting the battle of the American union. Did the Prime Minister dwell on that aspect? Did he say what Canada did for them at the time of that civil war. No he did not say so. Was this the action of a patriot, was this the action of a statesman, a man who desired to see amity, peace, and good will prevail between the peoples of the respective countries, or was it not the act of a man who seemed more impressed with a desire to sow the seeds of strife and discord, to create prejudices if prejudices did not exist? Small wonder under the circumstances that the American papers report that this part of his speech met with great applause, although I very much doubt if the better element of that self-same audience respected the hon. gentleman for thus speaking of his own country. I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not like to hear these quotations made. Hon. gentlemen opposite throw reflections on members of this side for casting aspersions on the loyalty of the Prime Minister. Have they a word to say in condemnation of these words? They have never been repudiated nor retracted. Why do they blame us for quoting the words of their own leader, why not visit their condemnation on their own leader. The Prime Minister said the other day: I am not an imperialist. These words were entirely superfluous coming from the right hon. gentleman.