

observed. I have said that the country west of the lakes is entitled to a representation of twenty-two members in this House more than it has to-day. I have already said, and I beg to repeat it, that of the members who are now in this House, twenty-one were elected on a policy which is absolutely contradicted by the Bill, the second reading of which we are now considering. Is it fair and right, and is it constitutional, that twenty-one men should sit in this House and vote on a measure absolutely contrary to the principles upon which they were elected? Twenty-one members of this House will misrepresent their constituents if they vote for this Bill, as I presume they will; twenty-one members sit in this House pledged to vote against a contribution to the British navy, and the Government depends for its continued existence upon the continuation of the support of these twenty-one members! The western country is entitled to twenty-two members more in this House than it has at the present time. If there was a redistribution of seats, according to the constitution, and a general election, if no changes were made in any of the other seats in this House; if the twenty-one constituencies I have mentioned were represented according to their views, and the twenty-two seats in the western country elected members to support a Canadian naval policy—and I venture to say that if this is the only issue, that is the only vote they will give—it would make a difference of sixty-six seats in this Parliament; it would put the Government of the day in a substantial minority in this House.

Now, that is the position, Mr. Speaker,—a government which does not, and which has no assurance that it represents a majority of the people of this country on this great and vital question, undertakes to put that measure through this House without condescending to give a reason for doing so. That is not government by majority, according to the constitution of this country, or according to British precedent; it is government by minority, regardless of constitutional rights, taking advantage of parliamentary procedure to hold on to power at the price of committing a great wrong upon Canada and the Empire.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett), at the outset of his very fervid and impassioned speech yesterday, stated that every member in this House should give reasons for the faith that is in him on this question. In the course of his observations, he made use of biblical quotations, and made frequent references to Scripture. I do not know whether, when enjoining upon the members of this House the duty of giving reasons for the faith that is in them, he intended to be taken as quoting from the Good Book or not. But

whether he did or not, I propose giving reasons for the faith that is in me so far as this question is concerned.

I feel I am particularly required to do so because I find that very little has been said on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite from my own province. I expected that they would have something to say in justification of the faith that they should have in that province. I expected that they would have something to say on the remarks that have been made to the effect that the province by the sea particularly is not capable of building ships, or of manning ships, or of properly engaging in the work of steel ship-building. Well, the hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia, who sit on the other side, have been silent, I regret to say; just why, it is not for me to say. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in discussing this question, proceed on the assumption that we occupy a position of humble dependence, that we owe a deep obligation, an actual money debt to Great Britain, which we must recognize and pay by means of a cash contribution, or by means of a gift of ships of war. They ignore the history of our country entirely. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), they ignore the great development that has taken place in this country in the past quarter of a century or more. They forget that Canada no longer occupies a position of servitude. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Calgary emphasize the fact that we were a colony. He seemed to gloat over the fact that we were a colony. Just why he impressed this House with the notion that we were merely a colony, I do not understand. I say we are no longer a colony in the proper sense of the word, and we resent being called colonists. The more considerate and polite Englishmen no longer used the word 'colonial' in regard to us. When we are dubbed colonists, or colonials, the blood rushes to our faces, and we feel indignant at the insult and affront, for such we regard it. In the past half century we have outgrown the status of a colony, and have become one of the King's dominions, a fact which hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to realize. We are now spoken of by the thoughtful statesmen of Britain, such as Harcourt, Balfour, Earl Grey, Asquith and others, as one of the King's overseas dominions. In the quotations that have been read in this House during this discussion, we have not had the word 'colony' used in reference to Canada, but have heard it spoken of as one of the overseas dominions. We have that pride in ourselves, in the stock from which we sprang, in our resources, wealth and marvellous development, and in the ability and capacity of our people which makes us regard ourselves as one of the greatest of the overseas dominions. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to forget