

in the message of a nature to guarantee to European sovereigns the maintenance of their American possessions intact against any possible attacks from the others in the event of a European war. There is no warrant in history and it is a simple distortion of the facts to pretend that we are in the least protected by the Monroe doctrine. The acceptance of that doctrine under such circumstances would be unworthy of any true patriotic Canadian. In case of war, say, between Germany and England, we would be belligerents according to international law, Monroe doctrine or no Monroe doctrine. Our young men would enlist, and Canada would be the chief source of food supply to the mother country as she partially is to-day. We all know that the food supply of a fighting nation is contraband of war, and therefore we would find that our ships would be seized or attacked and we could not rely upon the Monroe doctrine to protect these ships carrying the food supplies of Canada to the mother country. There is no warrant in history for the assumption that the Monroe doctrine protects us and it is, I repeat, unworthy of any true, patriotic Canadian to utter such a fallacy. It has been stated that we have no obligations towards Great Britain. My hon. friend said in so many words that what we have secured, we have secured through our own energy, through our own courage, through our own blood and through our own grit. I admit that our ancestors fought, but did they fight against Great Britain? My hon. friend referred a moment ago to 1837 and 1838. The patriots who rebelled in 1837 and 1838 did not fight Great Britain, or British institutions, or the British Crown. They rebelled against the Family Compact. They were only too prone and too happy to claim their privilege of British citizenship and if my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier will read one or two of the first paragraphs of the famous 92 resolutions presented to parliament by Papineau and Bédard he will see that the men of '37 and 38' were only claiming their rights as British citizens. I say, Sir, that we have obligations towards the mother country, that we are interested primarily to see her in the future, as she has been during the last century, the mistress of the seas. We are interested primarily in maintaining her supremacy, because we know that that supremacy has been the means of vindicating throughout not only the British dominions, but throughout the civilized world, wherever there were small nations curbed by tyranny, the principles of right, of justice and liberty. We pay no tribute. We contribute nothing towards her navy. We enjoy absolute autonomy, and it is through that autonomy, and of our own free will, that we to-day undertake to

build this Canadian navy in order to help the mother country in first defending our own coasts and co-operating loyally with her in case of emergency. The Conservatives say that the Liberal party and the Prime Minister have altered their policy. They quote in the province of Quebec, one line from a speech delivered by the Prime Minister in 1902 in which he stated that this young country was not to be drawn into the vortex of militarism. To that expression of the Liberal policy I assent as I assented a moment ago to the words spoken by His Excellency the Governor General. We are not a military party. We are a Canadian party. If we were for militarism we would accept the doctrine propounded by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We would throw our money into the British exchequer without counting, without discussing; we would send our men, without calling parliament, and without putting the regulations of our militia and of our navy under the control of the Canadian government. But, Sir, the Canadian constitution, give us, as British subjects, a salutary check—a check which we can impose even on His Majesty the King. Yes, Sir, that is no new doctrine. Let me quote from Lord Camden:

I will maintain it to my latest hour; taxation and representation are inseparable. This position is founded on the laws of nature; it is more, it is itself an eternal law of nature; for whatever is a man's own is absolutely his own; no man has a right to take it from him without his consent, either expressed by himself or his representative.

That is sound British doctrine, the doctrine for which Hampden fought, but I suppose he was only a pedant according to my hon. friend. Hampden and Pym stood and fought for such a principle and it is embalmed and ingrained in the British constitution of to-day. Yes, parliament can impose a salutary check even on His Majesty the King. I am not disloyal, Mr. Speaker, in uttering such words. Let me read again from Lord Camden:

To fix the era when the Commons began is perilous and destructive; to fix it in Edward's or Henry's reign is owing to the idle dreams of some whimsical, ill-judging antiquaries; but this point is too important to be left to such wrong-headed people. When did the House of Commons begin? When, My Lords? It began with the constitution. There is not a blade of grass growing in the most obscure corner of this kingdom which is not, which was not ever, represented since the constitution began. There is not a blade of grass which when taxed was not taxed by consent of the proprietor.

Lord Camden must have been a very disloyal subject indeed, and I am surprised he did not leave his head on the block in those dark days of despotism. Happily, the doc-