

side these gates, and beyond the reach of these tariffs, there is between these two Houses, the mother's and the daughter's, an ocean pathway, an ocean pathway which the mother and the daughter, actuated both by the same self interest and the same sentiments, are determined by organized, organic and united effort, by effort at once,—by blood and iron, if necessary, to keep open and under their joint control? Does the right hon. gentleman not know that over that self same pathway the daughter sent to her mother's house last year no less than 88 per cent of her enormous animal and agricultural exports, and no less than \$134,000,000 out of the \$260,000,000 of her total exports last year? Has it not occurred to the right hon. gentleman that as an insurance, an insurance which every sane man would place on his own private property, as an insurance of this great and growing trade en route, it would be good business for mother and daughter to join in the common task of keeping open for their mutual trade that ocean pathway between their houses? The component parts of the British empire have at least this in common, it is a condition not only of the prosperity, but of the very existence of each, that it shall at all times have a goodly portion of its wealth afloat upon the sea. That is true, as I say, of all the daughter states. But it has been left, as far as Canada is concerned, to the parent state to guard that trade route. Surely out of self interest we all should assume our share of the guardianship. But let us look at that in another way. From Halifax to Plymouth, from Quebec to Plymouth, of all the imperial trade routes, these are the shortest and most easily protected. To accept that short trade route between Canada and the motherland, as the main supply route will solve the most knotty problem in imperial defence, the problem of the food supply of England and the market of Canada in time of naval war. If we will but accept that route as the main supply route for the empire, and will join with the motherland in the common task of not only developing that trade, but protecting that route, we will do more than anything else could do to establish the market of England as the preserve of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian producer.

Let us then, as I have said, join with the motherland in developing that trade and that imperial navy to protect that trade route, and we will be joined with the mother country in interest as well as in heart, and we will be better prepared to maintain intact, in domain and untarnished in honour the splendid inheritance received from our forefathers.

But, Sir, apart altogether from these trade considerations, there is the relation—
Mr. COWAN.

ship which the right hon. gentleman has pointed out of mother and daughter. Out of that relationship there has been ever an increasing flow of affection, such an increasing flow of affection that not even the right hon. gentleman himself a few years ago was permitted to call a man from the old land either a foreigner or a stranger. 'So flows the stream and shall for ever flow.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, Kipling is correct—'Daughter, am I in my mother's house.' There is in Canada a love of the old land as the love of a mother, a love that comes uncalled, one knows not how. It comes in with the very air, with the instincts, with the first taste of the mother's milk, with the first beatings of the heart—

A mother is a mother still,
The holiest thing alive.

What ruthless hand would tear asunder those ties and make the daughter a stranger or a foreigner in her mother's house? I have spoken of the sacred relationship of mother and daughter. The right hon. gentleman seems to be unable to take any account of that relationship, and it would seem that his whole attitude in the public life of Canada, and especially as embodied in this Bill, is to absolutely ignore that feeling. I say that the time has come when the people of Canada, the free people of Canada, cannot allow this—shall I say this nonsense about independence and an independent navy to continue, even if we would. We owe it to our Canadian ancestors of whatever race, we owe it to the fathers of confederation, to preserve entire our rights of inheritance in that empire, the greatest empire the world has seen. We owe it to posterity not to suffer these rights to be severed, sundered or destroyed. But if it were possible for us to be insensible to these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation which we owe to ourselves and from which nothing can acquit us. To make the present necessity for empire-defence the stalking horse to a mean ambition for independence and an independent navy, and then, in the hour of struggle, before the eyes of the world and in the face of the common foe to withhold or withdraw that navy from that defence, would be a betrayal as much worse than open rebellion as a life of honour is better than one of disgrace. And, if that life be the bounty of heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of that gift, if by our own act and our own ignominy we find ourselves and our children rifled and bereft, in the eyes of the nations, of that fair name for national honour and national good faith without which no people can be otherwise than miserable and contemptible. That the Canadian people, if they had an opportunity of expressing their views at this moment, would be so utterly degenerate as to suffer this, as to allow us to pass an