

land. If we are true to our record, we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees, and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

This Bill is another act in the drama. He also said of late:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy.

Again:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) no doubt would prefer an English shilling to a Yankee dollar; but for my part I am differently constituted. I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling. . . . I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

I do not think there could be anything stronger than that. The aspiration and goal are distinctly set out there, and notwithstanding all the eloquence we have heard from the other side, those words mean something or they mean nothing. If he meant what he said, those words were tending towards separation. The right hon. gentleman said further:

The conduct of England and Canada during the civil war of 1861-66 was a disgrace to the civilization of England and Canada. . . . It is a great, a fatal mistake to make allegiance, British allegiance, the basis of trade. . . . The present position of Canada cannot last, even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and that the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place. I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and of Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States of America.

Did anybody ever hear sentiments like that from Sir John Macdonald? Never. Those who sit on this side of the House, and the great Conservative party, have never had to devote their time to defending the loyalty of their great leader, Sir John Macdonald, and no one regrets in this House more than I do that our good friends on the other side have to spend so much time in trying to defend the loyalty of the First Minister in this country.

Sir Wilfrid says when England is at war, Canada is at war, but explains his meaning by saying that not always when England is at war Canada is at war. He says for myself I do not hesitate to say that if that war, the Crimean war, were to be undertaken by England under similar circumstances, I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent that we should

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

take part in any such war. What was the position of loyal Sir John? What were his words, speaking in Toronto in 1888? Sir John said: Who can look back to the time when the Crimean war broke out and not remember with pride how Canada rose as one man to stand by the mother country. There was a rush of Canadians to go to the battlefield, and I had the pleasure to be instrumental in carrying a vote for \$100,000 from the public treasury in order to show that Canada made common cause with England in time of war.

The right hon. gentleman is fond of quoting Scripture. His words are very eloquent, and when he finds himself in what we might vulgarly call a tight place he resorts to Scripture. He said the other day:

I am bound to say at the same time that I have been censured and criticised—severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party boast of their imperialism.

In his address he said: I am not an imperialist, and I am not an anti-imperialist—whatever that may mean, but it is just like the phrase Sir Wilfrid used when he was trying to be at once a protectionist and a free trader. After coming into power, in writing to his friend, Mr. Bertram, in Toronto, he said:

There are those in the Liberal party who are protectionist doctrinaires, and there are those who are free trade doctrinaires. For my part I incline neither to one nor the other.

The two phrases are very similar, and are indicative of an opportunism that has characterized the right hon. gentleman from the beginning. To continue the quotation of the Prime Minister:

—severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party opposite boast of their imperialism, who carry abroad upon their foreheads the imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty.

Those of us over here who claim to be imperialists, may possibly in the eyes of the hon. gentleman bear some sort of a badge like the one to which it has referred, but it cannot be said of us that we ever said in Boston that we would not participate in the wars of Great Britain, nor could it be ascribed to any member of the Conservative party that at the time of the rebellion in the Northwest, he said that if he had been there he would have shouldered his musket on behalf of the rebels. It can never be said of this party that at the time of the South African war we refused to send soldiers, that it was unconstitu-