

648; public charge, 2,461; senility, 22; mental weakness, 133; general debility, 226; tuberculosis, 271. And yet the great flow of immigration goes on with careless inspection.

Canada has reached the time when she does not need to take anything but the best. The problem that confronts Canada today is one, not of securing immigration, but of assimilating the immigrant. We heard from time to time during the last parliament, from hon. gentlemen opposite that there was an antagonism between Ontario and the West. Why should there be such antagonism. The best that Ontario has had have gone to the West. What the West does the West does well, and in her efforts to assimilate and develop the citizens from foreign lands she has emptied our school-houses; she has made it impossible for us to get teachers for our schools. But there is no antagonism on Ontario's part for this. Ontario is proud to be playing her part, through the little red school-houses of the Western plain in continuing our ideals of order, justice and civilization.

I feel, Sir, that I am now getting on delicate ground, because I want to say a word on the navy question. If I can judge the general attitude of men on this question, it is possibly one of doubt and uncertainty. There is a fine old piece of colonial constitutional loyalty in the address which the Legislature of Upper Canada sent to the King on the 23rd of January, 1826, when they said:

We also, may it please Your Majesty, disclaim the opinion that because we inhabit a colony remote from the United Kingdom we are therefore not equally interested with other subjects of Your Majesty in every event that can tend to the strength and prosperity of the Empire and equally bound to share in the dangers and misfortunes of any war which may be necessary to vindicate the honour of Your Majesty's Crown or to maintain the rights of the British nation.

The reason I refer to that extract is that it differs so radically from the naval policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite as embodied in their Naval Service Act. I do not wish to precipitate a debate on this question; but, if I understood the debates of the last parliament two things were made manifestly clear: that the Canadian navy was not a part of the British navy, and that by some constitutional declaration of neutrality we were, if so desired, in case of any war, to remove ourselves, so to speak, from the sphere of activity. It is utterly impossible for me, as a lawyer, to comprehend by what declaration Canada, in time of need, can remove herself from the sphere of war unless she declares her independence. That is an objection to the Naval Service Act, and the naval policy of the right hon. gen-

tleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has a tendency towards a declaration of independence rather than a tendency towards a closer union of the Overseas Dominions with the British Crown.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the visit of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and his colleagues to London. It states three things, as I understand it: First, that there is necessity for aid; second, that there is an obligation on our part to assist; and, third, that we are willing to do something. The conditions, as I said a moment ago, are not outlined to us, so it is impossible or at least difficult to debate the question with any degree of fullness. Even the cursory reader cannot help being struck with the tremendous growth of the navies of the foreign powers. In looking through a return lately published by the British Government I find that the growth of naval expenditure by the chief European powers within the last decade has been as follows:

Country.	Expendi-	Expendi-	In-
	ture	ture	
	1901-2.	1912-13.	
Great Britain ..	£31,000,000	£45,000,000	50%
France.. . . .	14,000,000	18,000,000	30%
Russia.. . . .	9,000,000	18,000,000	100%
Germany.. . . .	9,000,000	22,000,000	140%
Austria-			
Hungary .. . .	2,000,000	6,000,000	300%
Italy .. . . .	5,000,000	9,000,000	90%

Can we be blind, Mr. Speaker, to these conditions? It is all very well to say that diplomacy may smooth the way. Diplomacy may tend to peace, but when the test comes England's right can only be maintained by England's might, and I say it is the duty of England and of the Overseas Dominions to see that that might is available when the time comes. The critics of the right hon. leader of the Government, say that, even assuming that the condition is critical, there is no obligation on the part of Canada to contribute, and they give various reasons for their belief. Some advance the Monroe doctrine. They say that the United States will not permit any foreign country to get a hold in Canada. When Mr. Speaker, did Canadians become so weak that they relied on the support of a foreign nation for their autonomy? If I understand correctly the spirit and intention of the Canadian people, they are determined that their nationalism will never rest on the will and favour of any foreign power. The critics again say that we owe no duty to England because she has not been fair in diplomacy. They quote Maine, Vermont, Oregon, Alaska, and similar cases. I have not the time, nor has the House the patience to permit me to unwind the tangled web of diplomacy in these cases, and it would be useless simply to contra-