

abandoned long years ago; he has little acquaintance with it, at least since I have been in the House. He gloried in the fact, however, that it was better to have 'diversity with integrity than uniformity with servility,' referring to my hon. friend who sits behind him. He also gloried in the fact that both the member for Jacques Cartier and himself, though they were at the antipodes upon this question, yet they joined harmoniously in condemning the policy of the government, as if anybody expected them to do anything else. He actually talked about the thumb screw, and the rack, and the composing room. Strange words these, and he presumed to attribute the advancement of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to the utilization of those instruments. Does my hon. friend imagine that he belongs to that class of men of whom the poet speaks:

Men whom the spoils of office will not buy,
Men whom the lust of office will not kill?

If he is under any delusion of that kind, he should disabuse his mind at once, because nobody in this country regards him as a man of that character. My hon. friend entered parliament in 1882 as an out-and-out temperance man and prohibitionist, advocating the most extreme legislation; as a man who was elected to parliament as an independent, a high-minded gentleman who was going to enter the arena of Canadian politics and look down from a lofty position, and regard big questions from a high standpoint. That was his position in 1882. I do not know whether the great Sir John Macdonald utilized any of those methods in bringing him to time. But when he told us that it took the Minister of the Interior ten years to get into line with his leader, I could not help thinking that it took my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) only three years to do so. I leave it to the imagination to suggest what were the influences that affected him. And his effort to justify himself in regard to his attitude last year was most amusing. After circling round and declaring that the first resolution meant that we should have a Canadian navy and not contributions, he boldly took the course of veering quite around. He admitted that last year he supported the proposition of a Canadian navy as opposed to contributions, and yet he never attempted to explain his attitude, or to show why he is taking the other position to-day, but he started off on that extreme course without any justification whatever. And didn't he grow eloquent over the terrible lack of judgment on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Militia, because, forsooth, they had not taken Canada's money and given it to the imperial government to supply a fleet unit on the Pacific! I wonder if the judgment of this

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

House is that the proper thing for Canada to do would be to provide a fleet unit on the Pacific, and by so doing leave the Atlantic seaports with all those lines of commerce with the mother country, unprotected? Yet he says they should have done that. Why, I venture to say that if my hon. friends who went over to England had promised to take the people's money and build a unit on the Pacific, he would have been the first man in Canada to raise his voice and denounce them for going beyond their instructions, for betraying the Canadian people, for putting their hands into the people's pockets and taking this money and throwing it away. The first man to have gone after them would have been the hon. member for North Toronto. Then my hon. friend grew facetious. He recalled the old story of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, and he went on to declare what the leader of the government had done, and said that he had conjured up a fiction of the imagination. Let us see what he said:

Then my hon. friend had a tilt with sundry windmills. He knows the story of the old knight and his doughty squire, filled full of the spirit of battle if not of conquest, bound for adventure, if not for human gore, who went around tilting at windmills. My right hon. friend before this audience and the wider audience of Canada, he did it to perfection, he did it well. What were the windmills with which he tilted? He tilted. 'Sir, against the windmill which he took as an enemy to responsible government, and he drove his spear through all the wings of the mill. He then went to the next windmill which represented in his mind's eye a sturdy opponent of Canadian autonomy, and he burst the wings of that mill. He proceeded and he met another enemy, conjured up, the enemy of the autonomy of this country in the shape of centralization of power in Downing street, and he tilted against that, and then filled with a lust for still further battle, he found another windmill which was taxation without representation, and he glugged his desire for warfare until he had demolished that one.

Then he said:

Who made that statement? The British government, the British admiralty, any person in a responsible position in this House or in the country? My hon. friend knows that when he made that statement it was a complete fiction of imagination.

Yet, these statements were made by somebody, and they were made in this House. They were made by a gentleman of some responsibility. Let me read some that were made on January 12 at page 1830 of 'Hansard':

Are we going to be in the position that the whole foreign policy of the empire is going to be framed, and formed, and carried out by a cabinet of men in Downing street, men absolutely controlled and elected by the electorate of the British isles; that we, British subjects like themselves, are going to be placed upon a different footing, that we will not have