

ask hon. gentlemen, even those who may differ from me, as to the cause to which they ascribe that the present Prime Minister of Canada leads his political party in his present capacity, is it not by reason of his commanding practically a solid majority from his native province, a majority that exceeds his majority in parliament, a majority which he has cultivated from almost his advent into political life down to the present time by promoting the nationalist cry in season and out of season? The Prime Minister would not occupy the position he fills to-day if he had not cultivated to a very large extent that spirit which is so strongly objected to by the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Roche) and Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Belcourt). Why it was the same leader who in the rebellion of 1885 in his place in the House of Commons, while the militia of Canada was fighting the battles of the Dominion on the plains of the Northwest, said, that had he been on the banks of the Saskatchewan with the half-breeds he would have shouldered his musket and fought beside them, notwithstanding the fact that two or three brave regiments from his own province were engaged in suppressing that rebellion. Was it not the same hon. gentleman, who previous to the South African war, made the boast among his countrymen that 'not a man, not a dollar' would be sent from Canada to help the imperial troops at the time of national stress and trouble. Yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite accusing those of their own party who may have sympathized with the National cry in Quebec in connection with the late election, of being disloyal to British institutions. I notice in the press and took the opportunity of clipping from some Quebec newspapers the campaign cry of the Liberal party themselves in that particular battle. I quote from the Montreal 'Witness' which is a government organ—

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—Oh, hardly.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—which has always been in sympathy with the Liberal party and fought their battles in season and out of season, notwithstanding the high moral attitude that paper takes on

other questions. Mr. Perrault, the government candidate in Drummond and Arthabaska, the gentleman who was the mouth-piece of the government and seeking the suffrages of the people of the constituency said:

Our fleet is not, and never will be, imperialistic; it is a step towards the independence of Canada.

Again another candidate, a member of the provincial House at Quebec declared that: 'It was a step towards the independence of Canada,' for only a nation could have its own navy:

Now, I ask myself the question as to where this charge of disloyalty belongs. I ask, is it more disloyal for the Nationalist party of the province of Quebec, represented by Mr. Bourassa and his friends, to have strongly taken the position that the Naval Bill should have been submitted to the vote of the people of Canada, that the present autonomy of the provinces of Canada should be maintained in its integrity as against the imperialistic movement which seems to be paramount at the present time, than for the friends of the government to represent to the people of Quebec that the government, by establishing a navy, has taken the first step to sever the ties which bind this Dominion to the mother country. In this country of free thought and free speech the charge of disloyalty should not lie against those who maintain that the present autonomy should be continued in its integrity any more than it could be said that the Little Englander is disloyal to the empire to which he belongs. There was a time when Bright, Cobden and Gladstone strongly advocated the severance of the colonies from the empire, and particularly the Dominion of Canada. It was well known, and will be found in the memoirs of the late Goldwin Smith, that at the time of the civil war in the United States, Bright and Gladstone suggested that for the purpose of propitiating United States sentiment and bringing it into harmony with that of Great Britain, Canada should be severed from the empire and handed over to the American republic. Would it be thought that Bright and Gladstone were necessarily disloyal, or that as British citizens they were less entitled to the respect and confidence of that