

that to-day they had got together during the course of the last year a fleet more powerful, both in quality of ships and in their numbers, in the divisions of which consisted in its organization, than any fleet this country ever possessed before during the whole of its time. It was a fleet twice as powerful as the German fleet in the North Sea—(cheers)—and when he said that, he wished emphatically to disassociate himself from the suggestion that there was, or ought to be, any unfriendly rivalry between this country and that great nation over the German ocean with which we did a great trade, and with which we desired to be on the most friendly footing. (Cheers.) Our duty and their duty was to see that defences were perfect, not in the interests of war, but in the interests of peace, and the most foolish thing that anybody could do was to make the kind of speeches that had been made recently by their opponents suggesting that there was some rivalry between us and Germany which must end in war. After all, it was the Liberal government, with the work it did of co-ordinating the forces of the empire last summer, with the work it did of organizing the foundations of an imperial navy—

That is how Mr. Haldane, the secretary for war—characterizes the part that Canada is playing in this matter.

—it was the Liberal government that had translated imperial federation into something like the beginnings of reality, instead of leaving it to rest either in vain declamation, or any proposal to impose taxes—

That is what my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) wishes to do—impose taxes.

—could in the end only have the result of irritation between the various parts of the empire.

Here is about what Mr. Asquith, the premier of England, said a month ago at Liverpool:

Let me say once for all and I speak with full deliberation and after careful inquiry—that the navy to-day is able to maintain not only this year but in the years that lie before us our supremacy at sea and should the necessity arise—which God forbid—to guarantee the integrity of our commerce and the inviolability of our empire.

Then, look at what Sir Edward Grey has said—and everybody who studies English politics looks upon Sir Edward Grey as in the very forefront of big men, the responsible men, of the empire. No matter to what political party a man may belong either in England or here, there is not a man, not even the most extreme Unionist of the old country, who will not tell you that Sir Edward Grey is a splendid man. He has been quoted in this House. But let us hear what he said in January last, referring to his speech of March, 1909:

We said that the situation would be serious if proper efforts were not made to maintain the navy, precisely because we wanted to impress the country with the need for making

those efforts, and with our intention to make them.

Just what I said. These men took the position they did in order to make their followers stand up for the proposition of a large expenditure for the navy. That shows why the English navy to-day occupies such a position of impregnable superiority that no man who is interested in the empire's future need worry about England's supremacy on the sea. That shows why the British budget to-day proposes an increase of £7,000,000 for naval expenditure over 1908. The apathy which seemed to have settled down over British people has now entirely disappeared as the result of the efforts of those English statesmen who have been able to bring their radical followers up to the position of supporting them in a policy of a strong navy. Now, if there is nothing in the objection of my hon. friend to sections 14 and 15, if contributions are not necessary, if there is no panic, then the result is that his resolution falls to the ground, and my hon. friend ought to return to the ground on which we all stood together last year, that we should relieve the British taxpayer of the responsibility of Canadian defence, that we should build up in Canada a fleet for inshore defence, to act in concert with the British navy in time of war. I hope my hon. friend will see his way to come back to that position. I am afraid, however, that if the influences with which the hon. member for North Toronto is so familiar, the thumb screw, the rack and the composing room, are still to prevail, there is little hope that my hon. friend will see the error of his way and retrace his steps.

Now, let me consider the policy of the hon. member for North Toronto. He does not care whether there is any necessity or not for a Canadian navy. Let us send over \$25,000,000 to the British government. Sir, that is an evidence of the utterly reckless character of my hon. friend, and shows him to possess those qualities which have rendered it impossible for the men who sit behind him to regard him as a serious factor as a leader in Canadian politics. The position taken by the hon. member for North Toronto on this question, far exceeding even the reckless character of the resolution of his leader, shows that he has become so partisan in his judgment of men and affairs that he is utterly unable to have a clear vision, such as we had reason to expect he was naturally endowed with. His whole speech was the speech of a partisan, not of a man who wished to approach big questions in a big way, of a man who was anxious to proceed on right lines in national politics. That has not been his position, and he appealed to heaven to witness his consistency. Well, I was struck with his attitude upon that question. Consistency is a virtue which he