

so considerable a body of men as 50,000. The campaign relating to that panic went on through 1847 and 1848. It was ended by something similar to what was sought in the recent budget as a cure for the late panic in England; the panic of 1847-48 was largely cured by an addition of five pence to the income tax. Hume pointed out that these panics in olden times were produced by old women, but that this panic and recent panics differed from the former ones in this regard that they are occasioned not by old women, but by too many clubs in London of half-pay officers who desire employment, and have nothing else to do except write letters to the papers pointing out the defenceless character of the empire and the danger of attack from this, that or the other enemy.

It must not be forgotten that Canadians must have regard to their own interests as well as to the immediate interests of Great Britain. It is no disloyalty to say that. By the way, there are some people who imagine that if a gentleman in this House, or in Canada indulges in a criticism which would be taken as a matter of course, a matter of ordinary intellectual interest in Great Britain, if say an Englishman who has come to this country, and is living here where he should be 'in Britain with elbow room and doubly free,' makes use of an expression that would attract no attention or would simply provoke an answering argument in England, the moment he says it in this country, the answer is that he is disloyal and a traitor. I claim as a British subject living in Canada that I am not going to sacrifice one of those rights which the Britisher who remains at home exercises constantly. Mr. Fred. Jane, recently Unionist candidate in Plymouth, has made a most effective reply to the remarkable book of Captain Mahan on 'The Influence of Sea Power'. In his answer he discusses the question of what must be the ultimate destiny of the great dominions of Britain beyond the sea. He argues and argues with great force and strength that the ultimate destiny of these great dominions must of necessity be independence. He invokes in support of that, history and all the thousand reasons that can be urged in favour of it. Does any one in England say that because Mr. Jane argues that the ultimate destiny of the great dominions must be independence, he is a traitor? And yet I find the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and even the hon. and learned member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) citing as disloyal a passage from a speech which I had the honour of making in the House last year on this subject in which I introduced Macaulay's reference to the New Zealander standing on London bridge and viewing the destruction around him. No one would ever accuse Macaulay of being

anti-British, and yet, because a Canadian, happens to venture on a line of argument like that, not indulging in any overt acts or doing anything to break the connection, but pointing out what may be the ultimate destiny of this country, he is met, not by argument or reasoning, but by the wild flopping of the old flag, and shouts of disloyalty. The time has come in this country when the people are sufficiently advanced to permit, without danger to our relation to the mother country, without the slightest danger to the interests of the empire or of Canada, every citizen of this country to indulge in the freest and most open possible manner, not only thought and intellectual exercises in regard to these matters, but open and free discussion of them.

The next panic that occurred in England was the panic from 1851 to 1854. That panic was raised in very much the same way. It was said that England was going to be invaded and occupied by an army of 50,000 Frenchmen. There was the usual complaint of some French General proposing and laying out the whole scheme for the invasion of England. He denied ever having made such a plan. No one ever produced it, but again and again it was reported that such a plan had been proposed by him. There were all the usual incidents of these panics, 'our special correspondents' at Paris kept writing about the vast increase in the French navy, and the same inquiry was made that has been made in this House repeatedly: What does France want of these ships, if not to attack England? The same cry that we hear to-day except that instead of France it is Germany, what can Germany be building ships for except to attack Great Britain? I want to know if France in those days, if Germany to-day, has not as reasonable and fair a right to build up her naval strength as Great Britain has? You must find and show some reasonable ground for believing that it is directed solely and wholly against Great Britain before you can start any complaint in regard to it. It is the duty of every great people to provide for their own defence. There never will be a time, I trust, when any portion of the British empire will not be ready to engage in the greatest sacrifice in order to protect itself against attack from without. But I say that it is the duty of every loyal subject of the British empire, that it is the duty of every man who is loyal to civilization and the happy progress of the world, not to go around howling and raising prejudices against Germany or any other country.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) read a number of German extracts, from articles for which I do not know how much had been paid by the magazines. One gentleman seemed to say that every na-