

There would be, presumably members from Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and Australia. If the representation was arranged on the basis of population, there would be forty-five members for Great Britain, seven or eight for Canada, one for New Zealand, two for South Africa, and five for Australia. Put the whole of the dominions together, and the forty-five would still be masters of the situation. At present Australia has a national voice, which is far more influential than if she was only a humble member of an Imperial orchestra.

So it is with us in Canada. We have now indirectly a national voice; we have an indirect influence in shaping the destinies of the Empire, which we would not have by being part of the Imperial orchestra. As Sir Joseph Ward suggests:

We should come dangerously near to getting back to the state of things which prevailed at the time of the North American rebellion in 1770. Such a parliament without powers of taxation would be rather idle. Let us suppose that a method of taxation is proposed in this Parliament which the forty-five British members think to be admirable, but which the Australian members think detestable. You would then find, if the tax ~~was~~ carried, that the dominions were being taxed by a method which they would consider most objectionable. Is this the way in which we are going to promote harmony and solidarity in the Empire?

These arguments ought to be conclusive to dispel the illusion that the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) and others of his kind pretend to have with respect to Imperial representation so far as Canada is concerned. As to this representation which we are told we will have, I quote from a recent article published in the University magazine, by Dr. McPhail, the scholarly editor of that magazine, and a son of the maritime provinces, in which reference is made to the opinion of the London Times:

A few days after Mr. Borden's utterance Mr. Asquith admitted in reply to a question that the Government had put forward the proposal to invite representatives to attend the meetings of the Committee on Imperial Defence, and that the proposal was accepted as desirable in principle by all the premiers. But the Times, on December 8, was careful to explain that such addition to the committee of defence would not in any way interfere with the present Cabinet Government in England of foreign affairs, that this committee existed solely to co-ordinate navy and military proposals with the requirements of the policy, as defined by the Cabinet, that it could commit the country, or the Empire, to nothing, that it had neither responsibility nor power, that it was a purely consultative body, and its character would not be altered by the appointment of a Canadian minister.

I might mention that the memorandum from the Secretary of the Colonies, Mr. Harcourt, is in line with the statement published in that article.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to another question upon which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to lay a good deal of stress. They refer to our humiliation and our shame and they virtually say that we have been sponging on Britain. The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) gave a series of figures to show our past indebtedness to that country and he proposed by this measure under consideration to liquidate a debt, which I think he said was something like \$245,000,000, if my memory serves me, by a payment of \$35,000,000 by Canada. He was going to pay England with seven cents on the dollar. That is another foul slander on the people of Canada. The pride and manhood of Canada never compromises at seven cents on the dollar or anything less than one hundred cents on the dollar. If any man thinks we are under any monetary obligation in this connection it is up to him to demand that an accounting be taken so that we may settle our indebtedness to the last farthing, even if we have to mortgage the country to do so. We owe a great deal to Britain it is true, but it is of a kind that cannot be measured in money. We owe loyalty and devotion to the Crown, and we are prepared to prove that loyalty and devotion in the future as we have in the past. But after all, did Great Britain make these expenditures of money, these loans, these investments, to which gentlemen opposite refer, without expecting a return? Have they not been made because they were considered profitable to her and is she not receiving good returns and good profits for the investment made? I do not propose to file any set-off or counter claim in this matter and strike a net balance; Canadians are not built that way; they are not so mercenary as to regard an argument of that kind. The fact is that we need not be ashamed of our conduct in that regard. With nations, as with individuals, the altruistic spirit does not entirely control, and when England engaged in war, first of conquest and then in defence of this portion of her territory, say what you will, she was actuated to a great extent by the interest of England and the prestige of her Empire and not moved exclusively by any particular benevolence to Canadians.

In answer to a remark made by the hon. member for Calgary last night, I desire to quote from the observations of some British statesmen and public men on this very question of what we owe to England, and what the purpose of this investment was. Many years ago there was a select committee appointed to inquire into the matter, and I quote from Kingdom papers No. 12. To commence with Earl Grey stated:

—and the naval expenditure which is frequently charged against our colonies, cannot in my opinion be so with any justice since,