

Then we have our hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). He came forward with the idea that this is to be a permanent policy, that if we are to contribute now we are to do it again, that we are to continue to do it and that we are to have one navy and one navy alone.

I am a strong advocate of the idea of one flag and one Sovereign, but when it comes to one fleet I do not subscribe to that proposition. It is not Canadian, it is not self-respecting, it is entirely antagonistic to the ideas and sentiments of our nationhood. Have, if you will, and I advocate the idea, a navy co-operating under the flag of Great Britain with the other navies of the separate nations of the British Empire, but the one fleet idea to me is repugnant. It is repugnant from the standpoint of my Canadianism, and more than that, it is repugnant from the standpoint of my allegiance to the British Empire. The moment you propose to carry out that idea you are simply preparing the way for irritation, for confusion, for bitterness; you are fanning the embers which burst into flame in 1776 in the thirteen colonies. You are retrograding; you are going back on history. Even if you were to attempt to have an association with the British navy and Canadians were in any way to assist in that one fleet, you would have all the irritation that has been incident to this country in connection with our military affairs. Who is there who cannot recall the difficulties that have occurred in this country within the past twenty years by reason of the fact that we had British military commanders here? I wish that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) were in his seat and that he would tell me what his experience has been in connection with having an officer from Great Britain in charge of our military affairs; the most unseemly difficulties arose, the most unseemly spectacles were presented to the people of the country. Under our newer and more democratic conditions, trained as we are in our environment, educated as we have been by reason of our conditions, we are alien to the class ideas of Great Britain. You cannot bring us together or have us come together any more than you can have oil and water mix. There would always be that conflict, that irritation, and if ever this country is brought into antagonism with the British Empire it will be because of the conditions which would arise from an attempt to bring together under one fleet the resources of Canada from the naval defence standpoint and the resources of the other sections of the Empire. I believe that British unity depends upon freedom, not upon restriction. If we are to carry out the policy suggested by the hon. member for Brantford and concurred in by other hon. members opposite, of paying tribute to the Imperial power, I believe you will be planning for that disruption

which will come as surely as did the disruption of the thirteen colonies from the Motherland in 1776. No more misguided course could be followed by the people of Canada and of the other young Empire nations, than that to adopt a policy of tribute and contribution. When these gentlemen opposite suggest a policy of contribution and one navy, they tell us that we are not capable of constructing and manning a nation of our own. I wonder if all the struggles in the past for responsible self-government have been in vain, and if the conditions of our young national life are such that they make problematical further advances in Canadian self-government. Has experience taught the Motherland and taught us that we have reached the limit of our possibilities in responsible self-government? No, Sir; experience has taught the opposite lesson. We remember that before the days of responsible government we were controlled from Downing street; we remember that everything was regulated from there. If we have reached the limit of our Canadian self-government, what becomes of the struggles of the forties and the fifties in these provinces when we sought to obtain the boon of responsible government? What about the struggle before Confederation, and what about all these ever-broadening powers that have been granted to us from that time on? When we asked for responsible government it was thought in England, and by the old Family Compact party in Canada, that it meant separation and independence. The same idea prevailed when Confederation was being discussed, and, Sir, we have to-day in the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, evidence that they breathe the same spirit as did the old Family Compact years ago. With the organization of constitutional government in Canada, judges and officers of state were appointed by Canada, and that Imperial direction of excise, customs and post office passed away. Later we had the withdrawal of the British regular soldiers and the Canadian militia inaugurated, and later the strongholds of Quebec, Halifax and Esquimaux were assumed by the Government of Canada. Then, Canada practically took control of her own treaty relations with foreign countries, and I hold, Sir, that the same broadening principle should be applied further and should include our own control of our naval defence. If we are able to look after our military affairs, why should we not be able to look after our naval defence affairs? In Great Britain and even in Canada, jingoes practically preach the doctrine that military and naval services are to be superior and outside of local Canadian authority. They want one fleet; they do not want the Canadian people to be self-reliant in that regard. Such a