

British Chancellor of the Exchequer. In a few weeks or months, we shall see what will take place, and, having seen that, it will be time enough to take a step.

Then, we were called upon to consider the political relations. As to the political relations which exist between Canada and the colonies generally and the mother land, they are perfectly satisfactory, they could not be improved, and any attempt which has been made with a view of improving them has only led to Utopia. I can dismiss this subject without further discussion and go on to say something with regard to the subject which was treated at some length by my hon. friend from Haldimand—the military relations between Canada and Great Britain. There is a school in Great Britain to-day, especially in the official world, whose object for years past has been to bring Canada into the military organizations of Great Britain. The views of that school and their expectations were presented to us by the Right Hon. St. John Brodrick, Secretary of State for War, and by Lord Selborne, First Lord of the Admiralty. But we could not see eye to eye with them, we could not approve their views, and had to propose an absolute demurrer to their contentions. I am aware that there are men, even in Canada, who use the argument that, because Canada is part of the British empire she should take part in the large expenditure necessary to provide the heavy armaments that Great Britain has to maintain because of her dominant position in the world. I can not see the force of that logic. It would imply that Great Britain and Canada were on a footing of equality, whereas we know that they are not on such a footing. Great Britain has powers that we have not. To mention no others, she has the treaty making powers which we have not. And the powers not being co-extensive, the obligations cannot be co-extensive. That argument would imply also that Canada and Great Britain have the same interest in all things. But we know by experience that we have not the same interests. The interests of Canada are divergent from those of Great Britain in many instances. This is seen in the fact that no two of the self-governing parts of the British empire have the same fiscal policy. That argument would imply also that Great Britain and Canada are on the same footing of development. Sir, we know only too well that we have obligations in this country which Great Britain is rid of. As a consequence of our geographical position, the immensity of our territory and the sparsity of our population, we have to assume obligations, to face difficulties and to perform works which in the parent country are left to private enterprise. But though, in all these, the position of the mother country and the colony may be unequal, yet, in the colony there is equal national pride and constitu-

tional jealousy of our rights. This, therefore, makes it absolutely impossible to entertain the proposition made to us. But I confess that we owe it to ourselves as a nation—as we claim to be—to assume our own defence. And, so far as that goes, if we have to spend more money upon military and naval service, I am sure that parliament and the Canadian people will not grudge any sum demanded for that purpose. But, to spend money outside of Canada for military purposes is a proposition that the Canadian people, I believe, are not prepared to accept at this moment. When, in 1899, we took part in the South African war, we did it not under any obligation, not in the execution of any duty which rested upon us—and, to give Great Britain her due, she did not claim it on such grounds either—but we did it simply because we thought it was right and proper to do so. But we refused to be bound for the future, and the position we took then I maintain still.

Now, my hon. friend from Haldimand stated a moment ago that the country was prosperous. He gave us a very splendid picture indeed of the position of Canada on entering the twentieth century. Though vivid, the colours were not too bright in which he painted the extension of our commerce, the development of our agriculture, the increase of our population and the advance of our industries. In all these facts, however, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was judiciously silent. The progress of Canada is an inspiring theme, but it does not appeal to my hon. friend or his followers. If they had to speak of destitution, poverty and ruin, their language would have been jubilant and exultant. But prosperity makes them dumb, whereas adversity would set their tongues wagging with a merry clatter from this time to the end of the session. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition undertook a missionary tour a few weeks ago to a certain part of the province of Ontario. While there he did not speak much on the subject of Canada's prosperity, but he spoke repeatedly on the alleged divisions in the ranks of the Liberal party.

I have no doubt my hon. friend can speak feelingly upon that subject, because he speaks of a party which, during some ten years in the past, exhibited amongst its leaders the proverbial amity that exists between cats and dogs. My hon. friend made a missionary tour some days ago in the province of Ontario, and among the leaders of the Conservative party he was like the last rose of summer, left blooming alone. I do not quarrel with my hon. friend upon that point, because I am bound to tell him that as between Liberals and Conservatives we do not view in the same way the divergencies of opinion that may exist between men professing the same political allegiance. It is a principle of the powerful political organization calling itself the Conservative