

belle, when people going out to fight in defence of Canada felt that they were fighting for Canada alone. But the history of our country since then precludes the possibility of any man regarding Canada simply as so much territory. As its very name implies, it is part of a great empire, made not by Englishmen, or Irishmen, or Scotchmen and not by all together, but an empire for the maintenance of which Canada also has sent her sons who have done their duty as nobly as have the inhabitants of the motherland itself. A hundred years ago, when the conqueror Napoleon had overrun the whole of Europe and it was feared that England would be his next conquest, when the people of England were trembling lest he should secure a lodging place upon their soil, the conqueror's fleet was cut out and destroyed by a little Armada under the command of Admiral Cunliffe Owen, himself a Canadian. And when we come further down in history we find the heroic defence of Kars, in which Sir Fenwick Williams immortalized himself as, perhaps, no other keeper of a besieged city ever did. And he was a Canadian, fighting not for Canada, but for the empire's fame. And when we come to the Indian mutiny and the heroic relief of Lucknow, we find that General Inglis, who held that city in spite of such tremendous difficulties, was a Canadian. And even in the charge of Balaklava, which all regret, but which all must admire, it was Colonel Dunn, himself a Canadian who led the gallant band. And, in these recent days Canadians have emulated the deeds of their forefathers in devotion to the empire. Lieut. Stairs, from my leader's city, won victories and gave up his life in duty to the empire in carrying on its work in the centre of Africa. And the very province represented by the hon. member for Labelle has sent her man; and I would like to know who, to-day, is doing more for the empire, or who stands higher in the empire than Sir Percy Girouard himself. So, Sir, I think we will find that not only in times of peace, when we send our representatives, such as Edward Blake and Sir Gilbert Parker, to the Imperial House of Commons and send peers like Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal to the most august deliberative body in the world, but in times of war, Canada is quite ready to do her part to build up and maintain the empire. If we come to discuss in the House questions as to whether Canada should contribute anything towards the maintenance of the army and navy of Great Britain, I for one would oppose as thoroughly as did any American at the time of the revolutionary war compulsory taxation by Great Britain. I would oppose that, and so would any Conservative in this House as vigorously as would the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) or the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne). While this is true, I think it a misfortune when a society lays down such rules as the

society which the hon. member addressed. I feel that a great injustice would be done to those people of the country who are anxious and willing to do their share, but who would be debarred from doing it because some one else objected to serve. We may recall that a session or two ago the right hon. the premier informed us that when in England he had not discussed imperial defence, but was willing to discuss trade, holding that one had nothing to do with the other. I remember calling the attention of the House at that time to the fact that the premier of Ontario, who is a staunch supporter and valued aide of the right hon. gentleman, had spoken in a number of places, and had contended that the true solution of the imperial defence question and of the trade question was the combining together of the two, and it was suggested that although the people of England would not be willing to put a duty of five cents on corn from other countries than Canada, because it would be taxing the people, they would be willing to do so if it was understood that the proceeds of such a tax were going into a war fund, and if we had the same thing in this country we might form a large war fund to assist in the defence of the empire, without really taxing a single citizen of the empire one dollar, as a large portion of the money would be contributed by outsiders paying for the privilege of doing business in our markets. I do not wish to suggest this, but I give it as the view of the prime minister of Ontario, and when a gentleman of his ability and experience entertains the idea that imperial defence could be provided for in this way, surely I cannot be going very far astray when I submit the proposition as one at least well worthy of consideration.

The programme that was introduced into the House yesterday by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) as being that of this society contained several clauses, and I would ask the House to calmly consider the effect of these clauses. The first clause is:

Opposition to the establishment of a naval school in Canada with the consent and for the benefit of the imperial authorities.

Now, supposing the imperial authorities wished to establish a naval school here and that no one would be compelled to attend it, would it not be an unjust thing if some one living in Ontario or Manitoba wished to attend but would not be permitted to do so, because some one else living in Quebec did not wish to attend? If attendance was made compulsory, I would join hands with my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), and agree that it would be a gross violation of the constitutional privileges of this country. But when the conditions are reversed, and those who do not wish to attend endeavour to prevent the attendance of those who desire to attend, there is just as much compulsion. The next clause is: