

of those countries quite as much as we are of England, and therefore we are contributing in the same way to the defence of Russia, of Poland and of Austria, and all other countries from which we get a foreign population. We are allowing these foreigners to come into this country on exactly the same terms as the Englishman, all of them get 160 acres of land free, after performing settlement duties in exactly the same manner. The Englishman gets no preference over the foreigner in that respect. It is indeed a strange argument to contend that in thus allowing Englishmen to come into our country and relieve the congestion in Great Britain, we are discharging our national duty in the way of defence. Now, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Roy) also stated that he was opposed to the construction of a Canadian navy; still he will vote for this Bill just the same. He spoke against the immediate construction of the Canadian navy, especially, he said, 'if it is intended to take part in England's wars.' I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will go down into the province of Quebec and tell the people that this navy is not intended to take part in England's wars, and in support of his position he will quote the expression of the Prime Minister, when he says that this navy will not go to war without the sanction and consent of the parliament of Canada, including the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. He will thus be able to argue that the navy will not take part in the wars of Great Britain, while the government supporters from Ontario will also quote from another speech of the Prime Minister on the second reading of the Bill when he said that when England is at war Canada is at war.

Mr. E. ROY. Does the hon. gentleman say that I was opposed last year to the construction of a Canadian navy?

Mr. ROCHE. I said the member for Dorchester; I presume the hon. gentleman is the member for Dorchester. I read the hon. gentleman's speech carefully, and I think if he reviews his own speech he will find that he spoke against the immediate construction of a navy for Canada, and especially, he said, 'if it was intended to take part in England's wars.'

Mr. E. ROY. I do not think the hon. gentleman has carefully read my speech.

Mr. ROCHE. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte) also reflected upon those who are in favour of contributing to the British navy, or who were in favour of taking any part at all in the defence of the empire. That hon. gentleman, speaking against the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto, says:

Instead of sacrificing millions in the construction of battleships and arming our coasts—

For what purpose?

—to flatter the imperialistic propensities of those whose erroneous patriotic ideas have misled them, provision should be made to ensure the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

Here is another gentleman who talks of the development of the resources of Canada as a discharge in full of our national obligations to the empire. This hon. gentleman, like the others, will line up and vote for this Bill for the construction of a Canadian navy, to take part, according to some hon. members, in England's wars, but according to other members, and according to the premier, not to take part in any of England's wars without the sanction of parliament. And these are the gentlemen who rise in parliament and cast aspersions upon hon. members on this side of the House for want of harmony in their views, and in face of their contrary pronouncements of last year, they now come forward and actually glory in their subserviency. These gentlemen take the position that because we are engaged in our own domestic affairs, and building public works, we should be exonerated from contributing to imperial defence. They put me in mind of a little clipping that I saw in a Liberal newspaper. I would like to call the attention to it of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who referred to members on our side of the House the other night as Little Canadians. This is what the paper stated:

While Britain is building Dreadnoughts, Canada is providing the sinews of war, food for the men whose physique, pluck and stamina energize these floating battlements. While others do the fighting, let Canada do the feeding.

This is the little Canadianism that I refer to the hon. member for Red Deer. He is quite willing, as one of these little Canadians, to stay at home and let Britain's sons from all the other colonies and from the motherland fight all the other nations of the world in defence of the empire, while Canadians stay at home, grow wheat and sell it at war prices. That is his idea of the status of a Canadian.

I would like to ask if this present policy is designed to materially enhance the fighting strength of the British navy? If it is not, then it is absolutely useless as a fighting force in the interest of the defence of the empire. So long as Britain's fleet remains supreme, so long as she maintains a two-power standard, so long as she is overwhelmingly superior to her foes, as she has been in the past, so long Canada will be immune from attack, because the respect that is paid to the Union Jack