

All this tonnage has been hitherto protected. Something like \$700,000,000 of our trade travels the high seas absolutely protected by the Royal navy, towards which Canada contributes nothing. Moreover, Canada does not contribute to the common defence of the empire. When the day comes when through international difficulties the existence of Canada is menaced, can the other parts of the empire be blamed if they decline to help us? What then becomes of Canadian hopes of a Canada one and indivisible? Mr. Speaker, when this government has been driven to act—and I use that word advisedly—I do not know of any one thing they have done in the way of expressions of loyalty or help to the empire that has not been forced upon them by the great Conservative party. When the government are driven to act, what do they propose to do? Just what any little South American republic would do. But the navy of any of these little republics is not reckoned in the safety or governance of the civilized world. Why should they do it? Because, sir, the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and the gentlemen who surround him to fail to recognize the position of Canada as an integral portion of the great empire of which we form so important a part. They are following the policy of Venezuela. It does not for the reason I have stated. Sir, in my opinion, it is an endeavour to differentiate between Britishism and Canadianism. I do not stand for a Canadian navy but for an imperial navy which will carry into the worlds' domains that conception of unity and co-ordination which, I believe, notwithstanding what may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite, is fast forming in the minds of our people.

My hon. friends opposite say that if we are to have a navy, we ought to build it at home. There is undoubtedly in that contention something which at first sight sounds very attractive. But even so, it is so contrary to anything these hon. gentlemen have ever advocated, that I cannot understand their bringing it forward as their policy now. Did you ever hear of these people advocating the building up of our home industries or the buying of goods at home if they could get them cheaper abroad? Has it not been the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite always to buy where you can buy the cheapest? In my own county, when talking about agricultural implements, my Liberal friends have time and time again put up to me the argument: Suppose you do make your own agricultural implements and increase your own home industries, see how much better implements you can get on the other side of the line. I now turn against them their own argu-

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

ment and I say that we are not in a position to-day to build Dreadnoughts that we are absolutely unable to do so. I even go further and say that if this government had any idea that they would ever have to depend on the ships they would build to protect our country, they would never dream of going to such a wholesale experiment. But they know well with whom they are dealing. They know that they are dealing with that old mother who has taken care of us all along the line, and they know that they can always depend on her to give us the protection of her ships, built out of the taxes of the English people and which have stood the test. It is about time that this government called off the bluff that they are trying to strengthen the empire and help the British navy. If we are going to sing God Save the King, and Rule Britannia, let us do something worth while and not embark on this miserably inadequate naval policy. When I consider the proposal of the right hon. the Prime Minister and his glowing statements about the duty of Canada towards the empire, I begin to have a new conception of the use of eloquence.

The declaration that if Canada should build a navy, that navy shall not be utilized for the empire unless Canada is satisfied that the cause is a just one, is to me offensive. What is the only inference which you can draw from such an assertion? It is this, we are willing to go to war with Great Britain so long as the war in which she is engaged is a just one. But is there any man in Canada to-day who believes that England will ever get into any other kind of a war. Does any one believe that that country, which has been the cradle of liberty for ages, which has ever stood for the rights of man, for the liberty of conscience, liberty of speech, justice and fair play—does any one in Canada believe that that country will ever engage in a war of tyranny and oppression? If we do not, then I say that when England turns to new ideas and engages in wars of this description, it will be time enough for Canada to turn to new gods.

I do not think that the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) answered very well the question put to him by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). In the British North America Act there is a clause, section 15, which provides:

The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

That section is embodied in the Bill in section 4, but there is in the Bill another clause, clause 18 which provides:

In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal