

get my imperialism? In that charter to which I referred a little while ago, the British North American Act, we find it. Do we realize what it contains? It may be studied in the light of one hundred years of British history, and every page will furnish a lesson. What does the preamble say?

Whereas the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

An Imperialist.

There is where I am. I belong to the Province of Ontario, federally united with the other provinces of Canada under the Crown. How can I be anything else but an imperialist? If I were not an imperialist I would be in favour of independence, but never in favour of annexation. As long as we are federally united under the Crown, so long I cannot help being an imperialist, if I am true to my obligation. The preamble proceeds:

With a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom.

The constitution of England has kept together her colonies for two hundred years or more. It has led to the union of England and Scotland and Ireland; it has kept the British empire together in the bonds of civil and religious liberty. Nowhere is the atmosphere so pure, nowhere is a man's home so much his castle, nowhere can a man walk so erect, and lift his forehead to the stars as in the British empire. That is why I am an imperialist. I could point to a dozen paragraphs in that Act to show where the principle prevails, that we are united federally, not separated, under the Crown of the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and if, as Mr. Borden says, it is possible that a contribution would lead to friction I do not want a contribution. If it is possible it may lead to separation, I do not want it; I want union. I want to carry out the principles of the British North American Act. I want to see Canada do her share in her own defence and in defence of the empire. Now at the risk of some repetition I am going to state why I am opposed to the present Bill. First, because it is unnecessary and of no possible use. It is absolutely of no use. My second objection is that it establishes a line of cleavage in defence between the two parties. Get rid of it and there is but one policy. Third, because it does not provide for the defence of Canada directly. Fourth, because if passed it might lead to friction with Britain. Fifth, because we have no evidence that it meets with public approval. Sixth, because it introduces a new practice in legislation not sanctioned by the usages of this constitution. Seventh, because it removes from the free control of Canada one of its effective elements of national defence, the three battleships proposed.

Where the Senate Stands.

That is why I am opposed to the Bill. Where does the Senate of Canada stand?

It stands for the defence of the Empire, from Australia to the Pole. Not on the North sea alone, but on every sea where the British flag floats in time of danger. I hope we are all agreed on that.

Secondly, we stand for as many battleships of the most modern type as are required; at any rate to the limit of our resources. The Bill does not do that.