

to give a contribution to the British navy or build a Canadian navy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. I say that my hon. friend, in this line of action, was simply seeking to fan the flames of discord. The course taken by the opposition shows simply an endeavour on their part to repeat their tactics of the year 1900, when we had one wing going to the English-speaking people of Canada and saying that this government was doing nothing for the empire but was seeking to bring about independence, and the other raising the cry in the province of Quebec that it was bartering away our autonomy and sacrificing everything to the British connection. These are tactics which it is only right and proper should be exposed. But where does the Liberal party stand in this matter? Have we any such ridiculous divisions in our ranks? No, Sir, the Liberal party stands solid to the only policy that can make Canada great and the empire secure. Our only strength as a nation lies in the fact that while, as a part of the great empire, we shall control our defence in times of peace, in times of stress and danger we may stand by the motherland when necessary. What should be the ambition of those who wish to see the empire as great and strong as it ought to be? Would they desire to see us relapse into the state of a crown colony and be content with paying tribute by way of contribution, or would they not rather have this country follow the policy spoken of by the hon. Mr. Fisher, at one time Premier of Australia, who declared that the five great self-governing colonies should prepare for their own defence the better to assist the empire in time of war. The position in which the Liberal party stands today is the same as that which was enunciated 45 years ago by the late George Brown, then leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario:

The colonies are now in a transition state. Gradually a different colonial system is being developed, and it will become year by year less a case of dependence on our part and of overruling protection on the part of the mother country, and more the case of a hearty and cordial alliance. Instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony England will have in us a friendly nation—a subordinate but still a powerful people to stand by her in North America in peace and war.

That was the policy laid down by George Brown in Ontario in 1865 and that defines the aspirations of the great leader of our party who has guided the destinies of our country during the past sixteen years. The spirit which animates that policy is well set forth by Mr. Jebb, whom I quoted the other night in reply to the hon. member for North Toronto:

My pages are concerned with the other soul—the embryo consciousness of the younger nations, which the English brother 'does not understand.' His notion of imperial union has been based upon that helpless 'Loyalty.' He has acquired the habit of supercilious condescension, as though he owned the whole empire—new nations and all. His instinct has been that the mere colonial ought to pay his share, and be thankful whilst the superior Englishmen runs the empire on his own lines. The soul of the empire is a perplexing mystery to him; partly because it is only now that even the elder of the new nations are bursting the colonial chrysalis; partly because, in the old country, the simple sense of patriotism has been suppressed beneath delusive cosmopolitanism. Yet he might understand if he tried to change places. Supposing Uncle Sam, in an absent-minded moment, made him a generous offer, namely to take over the British navy and run it for a nominal cash consideration. Would the over-taxed English brother jump at it? No, his dormant national pride rises in revolt. Then how can he expect new nations to pay hire for his navy? He complains that they do not take their share of the chores. It is his own fault, because he will not have them do it in self-respecting manner. For example, he trampled energetically upon the suggestion of national naval squadrons. He looks askance if they propose to do things in the British fashion. He thinks of it as 'disloyalty.' No wonder they are discouraged. The English brother talks pleasantly of alliance, but tries to force his supremacy. So they are constrained to imagine that national independence means cutting the painter. Ungrateful and disloyal colonies, to think that you should assert the temper which made England herself.

We say that the same spirit and the same traditions which have dominated the British race during its long history of 2,000 years should animate the Canadian people on the northern half of this continent. Those of us who are of the dominant race appreciate the fact that we are the inheritors of those institutions which have been the great factors in British supremacy throughout its long history, and those of us who form the minority appreciate in equal degree the liberties and the free institutions which we could not have got from any other nation.

This policy which has been inaugurated by our leader, is the only sound policy for Canada and both races in this country join in supporting it. Those of us who belong to the Liberal party, and many who do not, recognize in our great leader one whose legitimate ambition is the development of the idea of a nation within the empire, acting in concert with the other great self-governing colonies in the preservation of their local defence and autonomy and prompt to come to the assistance of the motherland. In the splendid path along which the great leader of the Liberal party has led this country, his achievements