

Act which is intended to give us the power, in the hour of struggle, to withhold our fleet and so declare the neutrality and therefore the independence of Canada—that the Canadian people would be so utterly degenerate as to suffer this—I refuse to think so meanly of them. The national honour of any country is the bulwark of its national interests. There is this distinction between individuals and nations: if you lower the honour of a man in the eyes of his equals he may still say: my fortune is not attacked, my estate is not impaired, the laws will protect my rights and my person, I have my independence. But, if you lower the honour of a nation in the eyes of the other nations of the earth you not only deface her colours, you strike down her shield, her credit is injured, her commerce suffers. If you take the awe from her flag, you take the wealth from her merchants, and from her people you take the power to check violence and wrong in behalf of liberty and right. No, the destiny of Canada is not in separation as provided by this Bill. But if separation must come, which heaven forbid, let it come without dishonour, and discredit, and disgrace to the people of Canada.

Now then, I would ask the House to recall the revelations made in the British House of Commons on the 16th of March last, as to the defences of the empire, revelations made by the leaders on both sides, and which revelations alone awoke Canada from her policy of drift, and awoke a desire not only in Canada but in all parts of the empire; a desire not to build separate navies, but a universal desire to strengthen the arm of whom?—to strengthen the arm of King Edward the peace maker by adding to the fighting strength of his navy. And in this connection Mr. Speaker, I cannot help remarking that there is not only in Canada, but throughout the whole of the British empire a rising tide of what I would call an inter-imperial brotherhood and interest, a rising tide of imperialism if you please; a tide of which this Bill takes no account and which the supporters of the government seem to mistake for little Canadianism. Blink their eyes to it as they please, there is that tide. In Canada that tide first set in with force as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the South African war in 1899. And on that occasion you will also remember that the right hon. the First Minister mistaking the backwash for the flood of that tide ordered it to recede, mark you, saying: Canada is not menaced. But, Sir, you will remember also that on that occasion history repeated herself, and, that full ebb and tide kept rolling steadily on and swept along with it the best of our Canadian boys to the defence of the empire, and the undying glory of their native land. Since that South African war that tide has still been rising,

growing with our growth, gathering volume and velocity, until to-day it must be reckoned with as a force-making for the stability of the empire and the strength of its rulers in the world. But the right hon. gentleman cannot see that; he is still unable to distinguish that great general ebb of the tide felt through every part of the British empire, from the little recoil, the little backwash which he detects in certain small portions of Canada. He still thinks that it is a spasmodic thing, as he himself has said: a mere wave of enthusiasm which manifests itself only when Great Britain is in danger. He does not realize and he will not learn from the lesson of 1899, that that rising tide is nothing in Canada but manly, robust, self-reliant, self-respecting Canadianism bent on maintaining British connection for Canada. By that feeling is demanded a navy built and equipped in Canada by Canadians so far as that can be done; a navy officered and manned in Canada, and provisioned by Canadian merchants, so far as that can be done. But, a navy one and indivisible with the imperial navy, a navy that will build up in Canada a buttress of that great arch of empire, the imperial navy, under which we have no pledge of permanent security, and the empire no guarantee of peaceful progress. But after all is it a navy Bill or is it a Bill of attainder against the opposition that is under discussion, or rather what do the government speakers take it to be? Let us examine? Again, let me follow that order of precedence I mentioned at first, namely, first Jove, then the satellites of Jove, and follow it in lighter vein than I have been pursuing. Perhaps the followers of the Prime Minister will prefer that instead of that metaphor I should adopt that rather impious metaphor used by the right hon. gentleman on the 5th of January last, in Toronto, and that I should call them not satellites of Jove, but the chickens, which, even as the hen, the right hon. gentleman has warmed and hatched into political existence if not significance.

Whichever you will, the order remains the same. Let us, then, examine the speeches made by the gentleman on the government benches and their followers. Let us take first the speech of the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister, it is true, tells us that he gets his naval policy from Kipling, but he quickly drops it at that; and then he charges full steam ahead a la 'Rainbow' at the member for North Toronto, and he says of him that: 'He is one of those who carry abroad upon their foreheads imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty.' The right hon. gentleman's