

British institutions? Does the true Briton upbraid the foreigner? Does he chide the alien? Does he slaughter the captured? The strength of the British empire and its institutions is that the Briton makes the foreigner feel that, under the British flag, he is better off than he was at home. Britain has always welcomed men from every country on the face of the earth. And how are British institutions to be maintained? They can never be maintained by fictitious resolutions. The sympathy of Canada with the spirit of the British empire can never be maintained by statute, by resolution, by edict, by force of any kind. What is it that attracts foreigners to this country? What makes them feel that in a British land they have the sympathy, support, the opportunity that it is not possible for them to have at home? The secret is that British institutions involve no tyranny upon any class. The one thing to be kept in mind in the development of Canada is to make every man feel, who was once an alien in this country and is evolving into a British subject, that we are not in a hurry to force him to declare that he is a loyal subject, or that he shares completely our enthusiasm for the grandeur of the British empire. If hon. gentlemen opposite had their way, if they could send money contributions from this country without the voice of the people, and if they could continue to tax the people to send money to be controlled and spent in Great Britain, it would not be long before we should have another such lesson as was taught when a large part of this continent was torn from the British empire. Mr. Speaker, the great secret of the development of British life in Canada lies in giving to every citizen of Canada the chance to work out his own salvation. Therefore, I maintain that no policy has ever come before this House that will do more for the development of our national spirit than the policy now under discussion.

What does this policy mean practically? We are not building navies for the purpose of having shipyards and docks, but we are building docks and shipyards because we are going to build a navy. Hon. members opposite have said that the strongest argument in support of our policy is the argument of the loaves and fishes. These are not the objects of this policy, but they are the results of this policy if carried out in a reasonable and businesslike way. Am I to assume that these hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to build our own shipyards, to dig our own docks, to develop our own mines, to construct our own ships, to employ our own sailors and fishermen? Am I to understand, as declared by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), that what we want is to go back to the Crown colony stage, and, every time we are in trouble, crawl to the feet of the parent country and importune her to inter-

Mr. RALPH SMITH.

vene and help us? I say, Sir, the policy of this government adds to the great name of this country, and gives an opportunity to the increasing intelligence of our citizens to go forward in national development, national manhood, national character, national strength, national defence, which, fifty years hence, will cause every man in Canada to wonder that any party in this country should have the want of foresight or audacity to question the necessity for the establishment of a naval force for our country.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, in rising to place myself on record on this important question, I wish to say, very modestly, that I cannot hope to add very much that is new to the debate. It has been the custom in this House, since I have been a member of it at least, for members on rising to address the House on almost any subject to make the claim that the subject to be dealt with is the most important question since confederation. Well, I have to confess and make that same assertion to-day. When I consider the far-reaching results which may come from the proposals which we are debating in this House and this country to-day, I think I can safely say that this is at least one of the most important questions since confederation. My hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) is certainly a very forceful speaker, but if we take from his address that part which he was forced to devote to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and other members of this House, there will not be very much left. The speech given by the hon. member for Vancouver last night caused a great deal of anxiety in the mind of the hon. member (Mr. Ralph Smith), who has just taken his seat, for he devoted to that speech a great part of the time he occupied in addressing the House. After getting through with the hon. member for Vancouver, he spent quite a time in talking about our friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Now, I am not going to take up much time—not because I do not regard it as important—in dealing with the address which we have just listened to. But I do wish to refer to a few matters in the hon. member's address. The feature of this debate has been as to what the individual or collective members of this House put upon this question, whether this Bill which the government has brought down tends to the consolidation of the empire, or whether it leads to disintegration. I believe, and I hope I shall be able to prove that it does lead to disintegration. Surely we have the right to determine what stand the right hon. lead-