

er of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has taken all along during the years in which he has been a prominent member of this House, and what that stand, if carried to its logical conclusion, would lead to. The hon. member for Nanaimo, referring to the right hon. leader of the House last night, said that there is no man strong enough to alienate the Canadian people from England. Thank God, Mr. Speaker there is not, notwithstanding the fact that if the words and deeds of the hon. gentleman who leads this House had been carried out they would have led to separation; but we have to be thankful to-day that, great as the influence of the hon. gentleman has been in this country it has not been sufficient, and never will be, to carry this country into separation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to address the House at any great length with regard to the remarks made by my hon. friend the member for Nanaimo. The naval policy of this government has been brought down. One thing is certain that everybody, or nearly everybody, feels that the present position of Canada is intolerable. Believing that the present position of Canada is intolerable, we are here as the representatives of the people to try and inaugurate a policy that will be to the practical benefit of this country and of Great Britain. This unanimity of opinion which I have expressed is the inevitable result of the growth of this country and of the agitation which has been going on for the past year or two. So much has been said on this question from the pulpit, from the platform, in the press, in private conversation, and in this House, that it is almost impossible for one to say anything new. All the sentiments and views to which anybody might give expression, or which I might state here to-day, have been more forcibly, logically and cogently expressed by others. Yet my own personal feeling in this matter is so great that it prevents me from remaining silent. I believe that my constituents would feel that I had not done my duty to them if I had not said something on this important subject. I feel confident that in speaking upon this question I am but the mouthpiece of a large majority of the people whom I have the honour to represent. Why are we discussing this question to-day? Is it because of anything the government has done? The opening up of this great problem, the awakening of the people to the duty which they owe to the empire, the arousing of the people to the task of doing something to relieve the taxpayer of Great Britain from the burden which has been upon him for years, did not originate in the mind of the right hon. the First Minister, or in the mind of any hon. gentleman in his cabinet. The right hon. First Minister has

said of late that something has been doing since 1902, something was doing in 1907, and something in 1909. I will take occasion to refer to that part of the hon. gentleman's speech further on. We are discussing this question to-day because of the motion and address spread upon 'Hansard' by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). There is absolutely no doubt about that. My hon. friend had his motion on the order paper long before this agitation commenced in this country. My hon. friend set the people thinking, and asking themselves the question whether it was not about time that we should begin to be ashamed of ourselves, because we were absolutely dependent on Great Britain for the protection of our trade routes, and for the protection of our trade, yet we were enjoying and receiving that protection without it costing us one cent. Having great faith in the independence of the people of this country I do not believe that they would be longer willing that such a condition should exist when they became familiar with the facts. Before we became of age, when we perhaps had a revenue of \$25,000,000, or \$30,000,000,000, or \$35,000,000 when we were in our swaddling clothes, we were very glad to receive the protection of Great Britain, but when we came of age we realized that the time had come when we should begin to do something for ourselves. The fact that we are the last of the great overseas dominions to come to our senses in this respect is not very much to our credit. What do we find? If I gathered anything from the words of the hon. member for Nanaimo just before he took his seat, it was that Great Britain was opposed to this contribution system. I do not know whether that is exactly correct or not. What I do know is that Australia, for years, has been giving £100,000 for the protection of the empire. I know that Cape Colony has been giving £50,000, I know that little New Zealand has been giving £40,000, Natal £35,000, and that Newfoundland has been giving its quota. What has Canada been doing? Absolutely nothing. We find that it costs the labouring people and citizens of Great Britain about \$4 per head per year for the maintenance of the navy, to say nothing of the militia. When we take the two into consideration, the people of Great Britain are paying for protection about \$455,000,000, to which we are not contributing one cent notwithstanding the fact that we are receiving great benefit from it. It is high time that we were up and doing. I do not agree with those who cry peace and believe we can escape the burden of an army and navy. We cannot become separated from the rest of the world in that respect. The United States tried it and absolutely failed. Canada, which we are proud of, and