

the fact that we are one of the greatest of the overseas dominions. All classes and creeds, all races and nationalities, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, are loyal and devoted to the Crown, proud of our constitution, and of British institutions. And why? Because our people are happy and contented in the full enjoyment of their liberties, in the complete right of self-government. It is because we have complete autonomy that we are so devoted to the Crown. We are a proud self-respecting nation, and we resent being called a colony. We are a proud self-respecting nation in a great galaxy of nations that make up the British Empire upon which the sun never sets.

I have remarked that in this country there is a spirit of satisfaction and a spirit of hope and confidence because of the fact that we have complete autonomy. Years ago it was not so. Years ago there was a spirit of unrest and dissatisfaction, and murmurings were heard in various parts of the country. Reference was made this evening to an annexation manifesto that was signed in this country, and mention was also made of the fact that the Governor General of the country was stoned in the city of Montreal, and that the parliament buildings were burned. That was a time when there was disloyalty, but let me say, not in any spirit of harshness or of acrimony, that it was the great loyalists, whose descendants or successors to-day shout loyalty, who committed those insults and outrages on the representatives of the King and on the institutions of the country.

Mr. EMMERSON: They were called Tories.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That was the time when we were ruled from Downing Street. It was before we had responsible government. But as soon as we got the opportunity to manage and control our own affairs, all that disappeared. If some day the people awoke to find that their autonomy was affected or that they had been deprived of the rights of self-government, the right of managing or controlling their own affairs in this country, a storm of indignation would arise that would threaten our present relations with and existence within the Empire. That is not an alarmist prophecy at all; it is a fact which every man in this House knows, and will admit, if he is bold enough to do so. That is exactly what I am afraid of in connection with the policy of the Government now under consideration.

It tends to stamp the Canadians with a badge of inferiority. It is a policy of tribute, and nothing else, and it is not consistent with our self-respect and status as a sister nation within the Empire to pay

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish)

taxes where we have no voice in the use to which our money goes. Hon. gentlemen argue that we retain control over our own expenditure, that this Parliament has to vote the money, and that we control it, and therefore, our autonomy is not affected. That is all right in words. But the practical effect of this legislation is that we are paying tribute to England, and are buying our protection and defence. We vote the money with which to buy these ships but we have virtually no check on or control of them when purchased; and therefore, I say this policy is one of tribute in its effect.

The hon. member from Brandon (Mr. Aikins) in his flowery, highly imaginative, and poetic speech made a quotation in which reference was made to the Danegeld. I thought at the time it was a most unfortunate allusion for him and the argument he sought to make. As I remember my British history, the Danegeld was an English national tax originally levied by Ethelred II, surnamed the Unready, as a means of raising the tribute which was the price of the temporary cessation of the Danish ravages. This expedient of buying off the invader was first adopted in 991 A.D. on the advice of certain great men of the Kingdom. This tax, which was exceedingly burdensome, was abolished in the time of Edward the Confessor.

How very like the Borden navy policy was the Danegeld. It is proposed to buy our protection by a contribution of \$35,000,000. We send it to England to protect our country and commerce. The English King levied the tax on his people, and sent the money to the Danes to buy protection; and he did this on the advice of certain great men of his country. Shall I call the right hon. the Prime Minister the Unready? I would be sorry to be discourteous to the Prime Minister because I have a warm affection and high regard for him. He is a Nova Scotian and we Nova Scotians are proud of him personally, although we are not proud of his policy. We regard his policy as nothing short of an insult to the people of the province from which he comes, besides being diametrically opposed to the development and the best interest of that province. The present Prime Minister, on the advice of certain great men of his party, the Nationalists and the Montreal Star stripe, levies this odious tax for a similar purpose. The Danegeld was an expedient; the Borden policy is an expedient.

In 1909, when he first spoke of contributions for the defence of the Empire, the present premier outlined a truly Canadian policy and he was in a great hurry to have it put into execution. He wanted things done at once. What happened in 1910? He talked contribution because of imminent peril. He did not seem quite ready to put