

other places; we have trade routes to Mexico and South America, and all that commerce is growing. I do not see that it is in danger. We do not see any enemy in sight, nor did we see any enemy when we organized the militia. We are at peace with the whole world, and may a bountiful Heaven permit that our peace will long abide with us, between us and the neighbouring republic, and between us and all other nations. But there comes a period in the history of a nation, as with an individual, when the obligations of manhood follow as a matter of course. When we reach our majority we become citizens and must discharge our duties as citizens if we are true to the country to which we belong. We assume the responsibilities of the home and family, and we must maintain that family, we must provide for it, nay more, we must defend it by lock and key. All these things are incidental to national growth. What was required of us thirty years ago is very different from what is required of us now, and perhaps very different from what may be required of us forty or fifty years hence. There is a day of small things with all nations. Thirty years ago, the United States had no navy except that constructed in haste during the civil war. Now it has an important navy, and is expending this year \$120,000,000 of money in adding to its efficiency. Every country in Europe of any importance has its navy. Spain, ancient, decrepid, subject to anarchy, and all the ills of a disunited people, still manages to maintain a navy of considerable efficiency. Portugal with five millions of people, Norway with two and a half millions, Sweden with five millions—I am speaking of countries with a smaller population than our—Netherlands, five million seven hundred thousand—all those countries have navies of considerable size, two or three or four battleships, cruisers, destroyers, torpedo boats and so on. The whole list of those armaments is supposed to be necessary for offence and defence. The question arises then, if it has been the policy of the old world, and nations have prospered under that policy, if it is in the air, if it is incident to nationhood that these countries shall have navies, we should naturally sit down and consider the situa-

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex).

tion, so far as we are concerned, and ask ourselves what is our duty. Are these precedents to be followed, or are they precedents to be avoided? If you come to this side of the water you will find that all the American Republics of South America, organized in the last thirty or forty years, have navies of their own. Argentina has two battleships, four armour-protected cruisers, and proposes to spend in the next five years seven millions upon the navy. Chili, with a population of 3,000,000, has a small navy. Brazil, 17,000,000 population, a very large navy; even the population of Mexico, a combination of Astec races and the Spaniard, has a navy of considerable importance. Not only have the great nations felt themselves to be under obligation either to maintain their dignity or to defend their trade, to follow in the footsteps of other nations, and arm themselves by sea as well as by land.

Following the same line, modern nations, such as the South American Republics, and Mexico and the United States, have taken the same line. Shall we pause now? Seeing that we have reached that degree of strength financially, that degree of strength in point of population, shall we pause, or shall we advance and finish, round off as it were that dignity and importance which we have attained, as a unit of the empire? I have said that nationhood necessarily involved proper means of defence. I may be told, however, that Canada is not a nation. Technically speaking it is not a nation, and yet we have all the attributes of a nation. We have for many years practically been consulted as to all treaty obligations which may influence our position as a Dominion. The Washington treaty, 1871, thirty-eight years ago, was submitted to parliament for ratification, such of it at least as effected Canada. The Fisheries treaty of 1885 was similarly treated, and in 1898, four representatives of Canada were on the Washington Commission that was asked to settle the question of fisheries, waterways and questions of trade, particularly with regard to the trade between Canada and the United States. Then with regard to the French treaty now before us, we may say, strictly speaking, although not technically, that treaty is a product of our Canadiana pleni-