

ing a Canadian navy, is that he wanted a voice in the foreign affairs policy of Great Britain. I understand that Mr. Lewis Harcourt and Mr. Asquith have since then told him that it is absolutely impossible to grant him a voice in Britain's foreign policy, and so far as I am concerned—and I have very strong convictions on that point—I do not want a voice in the management of Britain's foreign affairs, and I hope we shall never be asked to have such a voice. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said that my right hon. leader's policy tended towards separation. We might as well face this question fairly and honestly. In my opinion, there is nothing in the world that would tend so much to the separation of England from Canada as to give us a voice in the management of England's foreign affairs. The reason for that is obvious. If we had a part in the direction of England's foreign affairs, it would necessarily be a small part in comparison with that of England herself. And, as we are not faced, as England is, with European and Asiatic questions, it would be impossible for a minister in this country to be educated to understand these questions as they should be understood. There is no doubt in my mind but that, if Canada were represented in an Imperial council, our representative would at times disagree with the other members of that body. Would we not, as a nation, be bound to support his opinion; would we not be bound to be guided by his views? So far as I am personally concerned—and I think I speak for the people I have the honour to represent—I do not want a voice in the management of England's foreign policy. For the last one hundred years England has been capable of managing her own affairs of foreign policy. I hope that in the future we shall continue to be tied to England by the bonds of sentiment and patriotism; these ties are greater than any other that can bind us to the Mother Country. If we want to show our loyalty to Great Britain, we should allow Great Britain to send her merchandise into this country cheaper than she does at the present time; we would soon make \$35,000,000 for Great Britain if we lowered the tariff against her goods coming into this country. Great Britain does not need this contribution of \$35,000,000. Everybody who follows commercial transactions throughout the world knows that Great Britain last year had commercially one of the greatest years in her history. Despite the competition of Germany, despite the competition of the United States, England's foreign trade has been one and a half times greater than that of either of those countries. Then hon. gentlemen talk about the moral effect upon Europe of this \$35,000,000 contribution. Do you suppose that Germany, France, or any other country in Europe

Mr. NESBITT.

will not know how to size up the moral effect of \$35,000,000? What do they care for \$35,000,000?

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member—

Mr. NESBITT: Is my time up?

The CHAIRMAN: I was going to say that, unless the hon. gentleman has leave from the committee to proceed.

Mr. NESBITT: I have nothing further to say; I have no desire to infringe upon the rules.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, I desire—

Mr. GRAHAM: The gag is off.

Mr. WRIGHT: I desire to occupy the time of the House for a few moments with regard to this matter. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) says the gag is off; I wish it to be distinctly understood that there has been no gag applied to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House except the gag of common sense. I wish to consider for a moment the objections that have been raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the proposition that is before the Chair. We are told, in the first place, that there is no emergency. Anyone who has taken note of what is happening in the great countries of Europe; anyone who is familiar with the amount of money that is being spent in strengthening the armies and navies of European countries, must be blind indeed if he does not see a very great danger to the British Empire in these conditions. Considering the geographical position of the British isles; realizing that for the safety and supremacy of Great Britain she is dependent entirely upon her navy, it is the duty of every Canadian to do what he can to see that the safety and protection of Great Britain and her colonies is put beyond the shadow of a doubt. What is the next objection taken? Hon. gentlemen say we are sending out of this country \$35,000,000. What is their proposition? To build two fleet units and place one upon the Atlantic and one upon the Pacific. I had understood until lately that that was the intention, but I heard the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) say that that was not the intention of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I would like to know what their intention is? He says they are not going to have first-class battleships at all; how can they have fleet units without first-class battleships.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I do not want him to put into my mouth any words that