

policeman is a necessary part of our civilization. In the same way, armies and navies are part of the civilization of any country; we cannot dispense with them. It is our duty, then, to have a navy, tiny though it may be. I am sorry that I cannot hope that it will remain a tiny navy; it will grow; it will have to grow. At all events, I lay it down as a simple national duty, one that we must discharge, to have a navy. What is to be the character of that navy? Shall it be a national navy or not? Hon. members on the other side tell us, if I understand them aright, that, automatically, this navy must go into war the moment there is a declaration of war against Great Britain. I believe that these hon. gentlemen cannot maintain that proposition. If I understood the leader of the opposition, (Mr. R. L. Borden) aright, he himself did not make the statement unqualifiedly in the expressions with which he has favoured the House. I understood him to say that there might be some insignificant way in which our navy would not be called upon to take part.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said there might be a war in India or with some tribe in Africa which we would not hear about, and in which no navy would participate. But I asked the Prime Minister what would take place in case of a war with a great naval power.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The proposition, as I take it, involves the great mistake of assuming that a young country like Canada, should at once rank side by side with an old nation like England with duties and responsibilities equal to those that England has. Of course, if England were engaged in a life and death struggle—no, I will not say in a life and death struggle, but in a war which would tax her resources and put her in peril, or put her supremacy in peril—or, I would not say, in peril but in the balance, in the scales of destiny—then there could be no doubt that Canada, in a wave of enthusiasm, as I said on a former occasion, would carry every daughter nation to the assistance of Great Britain with all the resources at her command.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not the Prime Minister aware that the King of Prussia, in 1870, and for years before 1870, had absolute authority to call out the troops of Bavaria, Wurtemberg and Baden?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That has no relevancy to what I am saying. There is no doubt there may be cases in which, fortunately, the naval supremacy of Great Britain may be challenged. If, which God forbid, such an occasion should arise, then this navy of ours, small as it is, with all the resources of Canada behind it, will be

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

placed at the command of England. But there are wars in which Great Britain may be engaged which will not tax her resources, which will not put her in peril, and in which, in my humble judgment, it would be folly for Canada to take any part at all. I instanced, in discussing the first reading of this Bill, the Crimean war. I state now, as I stated then, that it would be folly for Canada to take part in such a war as the Crimean war.

Mr. HUGHES. Why?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because, as we know, everybody knows, the war in the Crimea was a causeless, senseless, useless war. Of course, it added to England's glory, for Britons remember with pride Inkerman, and still more Balaclava. But I say without hesitation that glory that is glory alone, is too dearly bought with war. The war of the Crimea was without cause and it proved to be without result—in my judgment, though others may not agree with me. My hon. friend may say that Canada should take part in such a war. I say, no. That is a matter upon which we can each have our own opinion. But I will go further. In 1881 there was a movement in Egypt under Arabi Pasha to free that country from the Khedive. I do not pass judgment at all whether it was a wise or unwise movement, but I call the attention of the House to the fact. England and France joined in a note to the powers that they would maintain the government of the Khedive. France withdrew from the trouble, but England went to war. She sent a fleet to Alexandria which bombarded Alexandria; she sent her army and re-established the government of the Khedive. Will any one tell me that Canada would have had any cause to take part in such a war as that? What reason would there have been for Canada to send her fleet, if she had had one, to take part in that war in Europe? There would have been no cause whatever. But England thought that she was bound to take part in such a war, and she did take part in it.

Well, Sir, I will not try to sail under false colours in this matter, I will say that in my judgment, if such a war were to occur again, there would be no reason whatever why Canada should go forth and take part in a war like that. But my hon. friend may say: What will Canada do in case England is engaged in a war which will tax her resources, a war which may be concluded in ten days' time, what should Canada do under such circumstances? The question is: Who is to determine whether the war is of such a character that Canada should take part in it? If you say that Canada is to take part in all the wars in which England may be engaged, then I have nothing more to say. But I maintain my position, and will maintain it, and