

ing introduced a measure which, more than any other single piece of legislation in recent years has served to rouse in the people of this country the slumbering spirit of Canadian nationality. I need not be told that that was not the intention of the Government in introducing this Bill, but precisely for that reason the result that I have mentioned is all the more grateful to me and to my fellow Liberals, who share with me the conviction that Canada's strength to Great Britain in time of need is to be measured, not by noisy protestations of loyalty; not by those muddled declamations about 'one flag, one fleet, one throne,' so frequently heard in the moist and mellow hours of so many dinners and banquets; not by free gifts or temporary loans of ships or money—not by any of these, but rather that Canada's strength to Great Britain in time of need is to be measured by Canada's unimpeded growth in all the attributes of self-government as an autonomous nation within the British Empire. As an old and observant member of this House, you, Sir, are aware that, thanks to successive jingo campaigns carried on by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends, it had ceased to be popular for an hon. gentleman of this House to describe himself as a Canadian. That state of affairs continued down to the very hour in which the right hon. Prime Minister introduced his naval proposals in this House on the 5th of December last. From that hour, Sir, a change set in. Opposition to the Government's proposals caused people to think for themselves, and I venture to say that within the past two months there has been a greater change in public opinion in Canada than ever before took place in this country with regard to any public question, within the same period of time. For one proof of that, let me refer you to the fact that one hon. gentleman after another has addressed himself to the consideration of these proposals simply as a Canadian, and such an avowal on his part has excited none of the surprise, none of the dissent, which it would have excited if made only a few months ago. The change to which I am alluding is at times unconsciously reflected by hon. gentlemen opposite, not so much by their words as by their actions in this House. You remember, Sir, with what acclamation they greeted the ponderous and somewhat theatric statement of their leader on the 5th of December last, that the clouds were heavy; that we could hear the booming of the distant thunder and see the lightning flashes above the horizon; and yet when these same words were quoted on Friday night last by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), they were greeted with derisive laughter by the very hon. gentlemen who, less than

Mr. MURPHY.

three months ago had so loudly acclaimed them. Statesmanlike words on the 5th of December—inflated rhetoric at the end of February. I need not multiply proofs of the changed and improved state of public opinion to which I have referred, but I trust that I have given sufficient evidence of the fact to encourage hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to persist in their opposition to this measure until the right hon. Prime Minister is forced to keep at least one of his pledges, and submit this proposal to the people.

From your knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of Canadian history, you are aware that when the people of what was formerly known as Upper Canada were called upon to decide the vital question of whether or not they should be governed by Downing Street, through a governor, or by a ministry responsible to them and to them only, the chief of one of the Iroquois tribes issued a proclamation, in which he said:

The real issue is, whether the country is to remain under the direction and government of the Queen, or become one of the United States.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that a reincarnation of that Iroquois chief must have inspired the present naval policy of this Government, and at the same time suggested the stock Tory argument that a Canadian naval policy tends to separation from Great Britain. In any event we have in the Bill now before this House the first proposal ever made by any political party in this country since responsible government was introduced, that we should deliberately abandon a principle for which Canadians of a past generation have fought and yielded up their lives, and any such abandonment put Canada back in the position of colonial dependence and colonial inferiority which marked her status in the days of the Family Compact. And why, Sir, are we asked to commit this act of national abasement? Simply to enable this coalition Government to pay the price of the alliance between the demon of jingoism and the demon of nationalism, and thus continue in power for a few months longer.

Now, Sir, there is a phase of this matter to which, in my judgment, too little attention has been paid in this discussion. In my opinion, it is not proper to advance this Bill another stage until we have had ministerial explanations as to the relations that existed between the right hon. the Prime Minister and his late colleague the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), upon this important question. It is true that the House has in its possession the letter of resignation written by the late