

on account of the nightmare which it caused them, he will be glad to tell them that these tall figures are altogether wrong, that they are merely the imaginings, the dreamings, the vapourings, the vagaries of the hon. member whom they have unwisely entrusted with their confidence. But that was not the only thing he said. My hon. friend also said that if we were to build a navy we would be drawn thereby into European wars. Need I say to my hon. friend that whether we have such a navy or not, we do not lose our right to self-government; that if we do have a navy, that navy will go to no war unless the parliament of Canada, including the hon. gentleman, choose to send it.

My hon. friend also blamed the government for proposing to begin the organization of a naval force. What is the object of that force, what is the occasion? We never had one before, and why should we have one now? he says. It is true, we never had a naval force before. I remember a time when we had no railways, when we had no public school system. But at the present time we have railways and we have school systems. And if now we have to organize a naval force it is because we are growing as a nation; it is the penalty of being a nation that we have to bear. Sir, I know of no nation having a sea coast of its own which has not thought it advisable to have a navy of its own. I know no nation which has a large sea coast but no navy. I speak under correction—there is one, I think Norway, and even that country has some naval defence. But Norway will never tempt the invader; there is nothing in Norway to tempt an invader. But Canada has its coal mines, its gold mines, its wheat fields, and its vast wealth may offer a temptation to the invader; and that is the reason, as was stated last year by the hon. member for North Toronto, that the time has come when we should move on. It was proposed that we should either make a money contribution or that we should do what would organize a naval force of our own. We have proposed to adopt the latter course.

There is one thing, however, on which I can agree with my hon. friend—perhaps he will permit me to agree with him. I am always glad to agree with him when I can do so. He told his electors of Jacques Cartier:

This is a Canadian question, we must view it from a Canadian standpoint primarily.

In this I quite agree with my hon. friend, it is a Canadian question, and we should deal with it as a Canadian question primarily. But there is something more than that. My hon. friend was right in saying this, but he did not go far enough, there is something else. We are Canadians, but we are something else also, we are British subjects. We have to consider this

subject, not only from the standpoint of our status as Canadians, but we have to approach it from the standpoint of our status as British subjects. It is conceivable that the interests of Canada and the interests of the mother country may vary upon some questions. That has happened in the past, and it may happen again. When that happened in the past it was the part of statesmanship to reconcile the conflicting interests, and if they happen to clash again it will be the part of statesmanship to reconcile them again on broad lines. But I am happy to say that, in so far as I can see, at all events—and in this matter I express my own opinion—in the present instance there is no clashing of interests between Canada and the mother country. Whatever is done for Canada will benefit the mother country; whatever is done for the mother country, will benefit Canada. Let me say also to my hon. friend that if we have duties to perform as Canadians, we have also duties to perform as British subjects. If we have rights, privileges, and responsibilities as Canadians, we also have rights, privileges and responsibilities as British subjects. But my hon. friend, in discussing this question, ignored altogether that side of it, he discussed it from the Canadian point of view alone. He should have gone further and should have discussed it from the point of view of our status as British subjects. We have to recognize our duties and responsibilities in that double capacity. When we approached this question and declared to the British authorities, as we did in 1902, that we would relieve them from the necessity of looking after the defences of our coasts which they had hitherto done, we were performing our duty as British subjects, and when we declared that we would undertake that task ourselves and keep it under our control, we were performing our duty as Canadian citizens.

I have to say to my hon. friend that I hold in my hand at the present moment a letter which I received a few days ago from a friend who was a visitor in the city of Rome, wherein is narrated an incident which throws a striking light upon the rights and privileges connected with our British citizenship. My hon. friend knows that there is in the city of Rome a Canadian college built a few years ago by priests of the Society of St. Sulpice of Montreal, and maintained by them for the education of young Roman Catholic students in theology. At the date of my friend's letter, on the 16th of October, the city of Rome, like many other cities in continental Europe, was in the throes of a violent commotion, occasioned by the execution of Professor Ferrer, in Barcelona. Riots were imminent at different points of the city. The Spanish embassy at the Quir-