Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend from Calgary asserted in a general way that some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had at some time or another said that we owe nothing to England. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say here that I have never heard a Liberal make that statement. But. I have heard it said openly in this House and elsewhere that gentlemen associated with the Conservative party have made that statement publicly on a great many occasions. For instance, in the Canadian Annual Review for 1910, a publication issued by Mr. Castell Hopkins, who is a great friend and admirer of the present Prime Minister, I find that statement attributed to some gentlemen on the other side of the House. Speaking about the naval campaign that was carried on in the province of Quebec during 1910, the Canadian Annual Review for that year, at page 185, gives an account of the meeting held at Rigaud in the constituency of Vaudreuil, represented by Major Boyer, a Liberal member in this House. This is what it says:

At Rigaud on the 26th, Mr. Cousineau, M. L.A., said that all England wanted at this time was to get a Canadian contribution to her budget; Mr. Rainville denounced the French papers of Montreal, as being sold to the project of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.'

I understand that the Mr. Rainville referred to is now a member of this House and supports the Conservative Government.

Mr. Gustave Boyer, M.P., Liberal, followed in reply. He said: 'The speakers that have preceded me said that we owe nothing to Great Britain. Is it not a fact, however, that we owe all to Great Britain? Is it not a fact that for the past fifty years we have had, under the protection of the British flag, more personal,political and municipal liberties than any other people on earth!

There you have a striking contrast at that one meeting between the utterances of gentlemen supporting the Conservative Government and the broad and patriotic utterances of the hon. member for Vaudreuil, who is a staunch Liberal. At another page in this volume reference is made to Albert Sévigny, who is described as a Quebec advocate, and I understand that this is Mr. Albert Sévigny who now represents Dorchester in this House and who is an ally of the present Government. The Canadian Annual Review says that Mr. Sevigny appears to have been a particularly inflammable speaker, and at page 196 I read:

At Tingwick (October 31,) Alfred Sévigny, a Quebec advocate, expressed himself as follows: 'The Laurier Cabinet is a Cabinet of Imperialists who want to sacrifice Canada's interests and plunge us into wars with which we have nothing to do. The navy Bill is an attempt by Ontario and the provinces of the west to coerce Quebec and enslave our people for ever. What has England ever done for you? She has no need of your help. She is strong enough to defend herself. Laurier's ideal is to make you the vassals of the majority in the west. You must protest by your vote against this slave traffic. You must protest against helping England in her wars; unless you do conscription will come next.

That will suffice to illustrate the difference between the two parties upon the question as to what we in this country owe to England.

My hon. friend from Calgary spoke about several leaders of the Liberal party who favoured independence, and to support his statement he quoted a resolution said to have been moved at the National Club in Montreal in the year 1890 bv my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Later on, my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) dealt very happily with the remarks of the hon. member with regard to that resolution. I have only to add that the hon. member for Calgary must have felt the desperate position of himself and his party when he had to go back twenty-three years in the hope of finding something that would remove from the political skirts of himself and his friends the pitch with which they have been defiled through their recent political association with the Nationalist party of the Province of Quebec. I would have thought that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of the record of his own party would have deterred him from taking that excursion into a field in which he thought he would find something committing the Liberal party to a policy of independence. However, as the hon. gentleman seems to be fond of looking up records let me refer him to a few. Let me refer him for instance to a book published by Mr. Weir, entitled 'Sixty Years in Canada.' If he will look at page 52 of that book, he will find the beginning of a manifesto addressed to the people of Canada and favouring the annexation of Canada to the United States; if he will look further he will find at page 63 the signatories to that manifesto and I call his special attention to the first name on that list. That name is not the name of a French-Canadian; it is not a name that by any fancy can be associated with Laurier or Lemieux; it is the name of J. J. C. Abbott, a gentleman who at one time was an honoured member of this House, and later became leader of the Conservative party and Prime Minister of Canada. I would refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennet) to that manifesto and ask him how he can reconcile his present protestations of loyalty with his conduct in having followed a leader who at one time headed the annexationist party in this country? Further, I would ask the hon. gentleman how he can purge himself from the taint of disloyalty that must according to his standard attach