

tics and disturbed by old-world quarrels, it will be impossible to give to the home situation the careful, painstaking attention that situation calls for.

I must quote also from another article from the same paper on the same date entitled 'Part of a General Scheme' for it goes to support what I stated a moment ago as the result of a general view of what had taken place at the conference.

This proposal to create a Canadian navy is but one part of a general plan now being put into operation. It was preceded by a change in the Militia Act giving to the government power, which it did not before possess, to order Canada's land forces on service outside the borders of Canada. It is being accompanied by a reorganization of these same forces which will make these correspond with the organization of the British army to the end that British and Canadian troops may fit in together when called upon for joint action in foreign war. The intention on the part of those behind the new movement, is to gradually develop very considerable naval and military forces in this country that will be part of a world-wide war power, and available on call for service in any country to which they may be called by the central authority.

Such a scheme cannot be carried out in its entirety without effecting a fundamental change in the character and ideals of our people.

The writer goes on to point out very correctly and I think wisely that the whole course of thought, the idiosyncrasy, if I might use the term, the mental structure of the people of this country will be completely changed and this transformation will be from a new world and a young nation suddenly to the old world with all the vices, embarrassment and troubles that attach to that sudden change.

Therefore I say we have no control over the government and no representatives in the parliament which makes and unmakes wars and controls our destiny.

Now I wish to say a word or two in regard to the character of this contemplated change and I shall say it briefly. Up to 1894 and even to a later date the British government never for a moment intended that Canada should do more than provide for its own defence. Never up to 1894 was that contention put forth, although the matter had received the constant attention of the imperial government, and although on more than one occasion that government had given to us in authoritative and official form communication of the conclusions at which it had arrived. With regard to defence, we have never, as I stated before, shirked the duty which seemed to be imposed upon us properly of attending to the defence of this country. We gave proof of that in 1776. The right hon. Prime Minister alluded to what we did at that time. We gave further proof

of it in 1812 and 1814. No sacrifice was spared by the people of Canada to provide as far as we possibly could against American invasion and we did our full duty at that time as history proves. After we succeeded in obtaining responsible government in 1848, the British government began insisting—I do not say improperly—I say properly—that as a corollary duty of the liberty we then had acquired we should provide for self-defence and that duty should be performed. I stated, that when I, in answer to a call from my electors, gave them my opinion on this question. We took in this country at that time the ground that we must organize our own defence and the attitude of Cartier and his associates is not open to any doubt upon that point. No suggestion was ever made at that time that we should go beyond that. The utterances of Cartier and Macdonald go to prove that. I do not fear to assert that the traditions of the Conservative party, as I read them, point to the fact that that was the policy of the party. It started from the principle that having local self-government we must be ready to assume the duty of self-defence. These statements never went further than that; and when allusions are sometimes made to strong expressions by Sir George Cartier and Sir John Macdonald on the necessity of maintaining British connections, these expressions were always used in reply to the outpourings of friends of the Prime Minister, of the Prime Minister himself, when they ventilated policies such as those my hon. friend the leader of the opposition described to-day, and when they spoke of breaking down the barriers existing between us and the United States and pointed to the inevitable destiny of being absorbed by the great republic which awaited us. But nowhere will you find in the utterances of these great forerunners of the present Conservative party, nowhere will you find in the speeches of Sir John Macdonald or Sir George Cartier or of their successors the formulation of any such ideas as that we should go beyond the maintenance of our actual position. I had the honour, although I was very young at the time, of knowing the late Sir John Macdonald and also the late Sir George Cartier, who was an intimate friend of my family, and of whom I may say with the poet that he danced my infancy on his knee, and I am aware that these men were loyal subjects of the Crown and opposed to any policy which would lead to the severing of the tie that bound us to the mother country and which they deemed so essential to our welfare. But everybody who has studied history, everybody who has read the imperial state papers referring to Canada, from 1860 to 1867, everybody who has read the life of Sir George Cartier knows that he never went beyond that, and