

and yet was to be stripped of all power and authority, and to be reduced to that degree of power which was vested in the Sovereign of this country; it was inconsistent with Colonial dependence altogether and was overlooking altogether the district on which must subsist between an independent country and a country subject to the domination of the Mother Country.

That is the way the Tories of England regarded the agitation on the part of the Liberals of Canada for responsible government. They thought that such a thing as responsible government was not compatible with monarchical institutions. What does the sequel prove? Instead of having such a condition of dissatisfaction and such a feeling of unrest as existed at that time, that the Tory party stoned the Governor General in Montreal and burned the Parliament buildings, you have a happy, peaceful and contented people. So much for the separatist policy. That argument is of all arguments the most absurd and most futile that I can conceive of. For what purpose do they wish to contribute this thirty-five millions? It is admitted on all sides that no emergency exists. It is true there is the possibility of war. The United States is in danger of war, China is in danger of war, Japan is in danger of war; all the nations of the world are in danger of war; but there is no greater danger now for England than there was twenty or twenty-five years ago; and is she not relatively as well able to cope with the situation to-day as she was in years gone by? English statesmen show that conclusively. Even as late as January 30, Mr. Winston Churchill, while speaking at a banquet in Dundee on that date, in which the health of the navy was proposed, said:

You have drunk this afternoon the health of the navy. The navy is strong and it needs to be strong in times like these. (Hear, hear.) When I have an opportunity of addressing the House of Commons in March, if I should be called upon to do so, on the Naval Estimates for the year, I am confident I shall be able to show that the navy is not only strong but is getting stronger, actually and relatively, and that there is no danger whatever to the great position we have acquired and which we have set ourselves resolutely to maintain from being diminished or undetermined by the progress of time or by the changes in naval science.

Those on the opposite side say that money ought to be sent to relieve the burden that is upon the poor British taxpayer. The Montreal Star used to make most pathetic appeals in that regard. Is this contribution lessening the burden of the British taxpayer to the extent of one dollar? By no means, because it is simply a proposal that this country, which is the most heavily taxed country in the world to-day, shall pay thirty-five million

dollars out of the treasury to provide additional war ships for England which she must man and maintain at the expense of the British taxpayer. I was going to quote from Winston Churchill's reply to Lord Beresford, but the gist of his remarks,—is this. He, the Lord of the Admiralty stated that the ships that we were to build were to be in addition to what Britain had intended to build herself; that is, that Britain was to carry on her regular programme of ship-building, and that our three ships were to be additional, and that the Dominion Government stipulated for that. If these three ships are going to be additional to the regular number of Britain's ships, whether we contribute or not, how do we reduce the burden of taxation on the British taxpayer? On the other hand, inasmuch as we are imposing these three additional ships upon her, and inasmuch as we are not providing the money to man or maintain them, we are adding to the burden of the British taxpayer, so that the poor weary Titan's load, instead of getting less, is going to be heavier. Will you excuse me Mr. Speaker if I weary you with another quotation? It is from the same article of Dr. McPhail:

Of course it must be taken into account that if the English people had thought it necessary to increase the fleet by these ships, the burden would have fallen upon them. On the other hand, this 'gift' imposes on the English taxpayer, the burden of its maintenance. As, Mr. G. B. Shaw, with his usual common-sense, said, the ships are to be put out to be nursed until they are ordered home. One can will imagine an Englishman putting the case in this form. I will make Dyon a gift of my house on precisely the same conditions namely that you equip it with servants; that you keep it in repair; that you shelter me and my family not only in this house but in all others which you may chance to pass; and finally, that you give it back to me whenever I choose to recall the gift.

The Liberal party stand for the building of a Canadian fleet. I regret that the necessities of the case demand that such an expenditure should be undertaken. As I said before, a good many people in Canada would rather see this money expended for peaceful purposes in the development of our country. As we grow into nationhood, we have to accept the burdens of nationhood, and this is one of them. Whilst we all rejoice in the fact that we have one King, one flag and one Empire, I cannot for the life of me understand the argument that there should be only one navy. Leading statesmen in Britain, at the various conferences which were held, did not declare for one navy. Why should there be one navy more than one army? Why can we not co-operate in the defence of the Empire by having our naval forces here for our own protection under our own

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).