

ing the old homestead in due time? What pleases the old man's heart better than to get the glad news that every member of his family, perhaps a hundred miles away, is building a home for himself, is prosperous and happy? What is it that contributes to the happiness and security of the old homestead under those circumstances? Is it the prosperity and security of the sons that have gone away from home. That, Sir, is the prosperity and security of the British empire to-day. I know how the imperialists would maintain it; I understand something of the tactics of the ultra-imperialists in England, and I believe they have very close relations in this country. The attitude and the doctrine of the imperialist is to interest himself in the affairs of people far away from home; he takes credit to himself for looking after the interests of other people. But the policy of the great democratic party in England, and the policy of democracy in any country, is first to set your own house in order. The empire is being maintained to-day under the policy of giving self-government to every colony in the empire, and encouraging it to depend upon its own resources. My hon. friends cannot have read the correspondence of the imperial conferences that have been held since 1897, they cannot have traced the political evolution in the relation of the independent colonies to the empire, as seen in the proceedings of those imperial conferences. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will bear me out in saying that at that time Canada was the only colony represented in that conference to suggest that the proper thing to do was to look after Canada, and by so doing they would be looking after the empire. Every other colony represented in those conferences right down to the last one, was in favour of giving Dreadnoughts, of making contributions. But a change has come over their minds, and to-day what is the declaration? I have the record, and one of the most respectable reviews in Australia, one of the strongest men in Australia, says that public sentiment in Australia to-day is entirely opposed to the policy of a contribution, and that they have started out to defend themselves. They believe that the creation of an Australian naval defence within a few years will be a handsome contribution to the integrity of the British empire. That is all in keeping with the policy of Great Britain herself. Now, I will read a resolution which was passed in the imperial parliament in 1862, and that policy has been maintained up to the present time:

That this House (while fully recognizing the claims of all portions of the British empire to imperial aid in their protection against perils arising from the consequences of imperial policy)—

The British House of Commons had no idea of the colonies subscribing money for the support of the British empire, but they were making provision in that resolution for the imperial government subscribing to assist the colonies under the disadvantages that accrued to them from the operation of the imperial policy:

—is of opinion that the colonies exercising the rights of self-government ought to undertake the main responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security, and ought to assist in their own external defence.

That resolution was passed unanimously in 1862, by the British parliament. In 1865, the Colonial Naval Defence Act was passed. Its object was to enable the colonies to provide for naval defence, and the Act empowers colonial governments to provide men and vessels of war, and also to raise volunteer forces to form part of the royal navy reserve established under the Act of parliament of 1859. This is what the Act says:

The members of such reserves will be available for general service in the Royal navy in time of emergency, when an offer is made by the government of a colony to place them at the disposal of the imperial government.

Sir, when hon. gentlemen come to this House and propose that this country make a subscription to the empire in opposition to the policy of the establishment of a Canadian navy, I say they place themselves in direct contradiction to the policy of Great Britain for the last fifty years. Great Britain has always recognized that the security of the empire depended upon the strength and force of every part of that empire. Canada is the most difficult country within the empire to govern, Canada with its mixed nationality—and this is no reflection upon any people in this House or out of it. The very basis of this country is a constitution for mixed nationalities. In the nature of things, in the peculiar position of this country—enormous country as it is—every nationality in the world is being brought to Canada. The great problem for this country to consider is how these aliens and divergent peoples are to be blended into one. That is the commanding business of the statesman of the future. How is he to accomplish it? By raising sectional cries? By questioning the loyalty of a French Canadian Prime Minister? By telling every Greek, every Galician, every Doukhobor, every alien who may have made his home in this country that he is in a foreign land? Is that the policy which is to shape into unity the development of Canada? That is the policy of more than one hon. gentleman in this debate who has uttered insinuations or made direct assaults against important sections and influences in Canada.

Sir, what is the great characteristic of