

in a speech which he delivered last session in which he undertook to prophesy. I remember the prophecy, because I thought at the time it was a daring prophecy, and I recalled the advice of Hosea Bigelow that a man should not prophesy unless he knows. The hon. member, speaking in almost poetic language, in language that might almost be grafted into one of the Old Testament books, told us that before the June sun melted the snow from the hills we would be at war with Germany. I could not find the passage in 'Hansard,' but I distinctly remember these words being uttered in this House. In view of that prophecy, and the force with which it was delivered and the importance attached to it, I need not devote more time to replying to that hon. member's speech.

It may not be a very easy matter to ascertain how this panic or scare arose; that it arose is beyond question. It seems to be inherent in the British mind that every 12 or 15 years they must have a panic or a war scare to relieve their feelings. There seems to be a certain amount of nervous fire-damp which collects in the British heart and which has to be let off in some way, and if there is no war or active work to relieve them of it, they must get into a panic or a scare. The scare was about due when it broke out last year, and there were political reasons at that time which made it convenient. There was this fire-damp in the air and it required something to touch it off. The elections came on, and they, with one or two other things were sufficient, and we had the explosion. But men forget these scares and panics, those who suffer most from them are as cool and collected as any one else, in the face of real danger. Should war break out their scare would pass away. In a short time this scare will pass away without war, we will hear no more panic, and the panic-mongers will be ready to take their part, the old fighting blood of their race will assert itself, and they will wonder that they were scared at a shadow.

Another scare will be due in another 12 years' time, and I have no doubt that those then living will see and understand it. What form it will take it is not possible at this distance to tell. The scares have been numerous. I was looking up the other day some points in connection with the maritime provinces representation case, and I found in the debates of Prince Edward Island, 1864, that one reason advanced by a gentleman in favour of confederation was that we would be protected from the danger of aggression from Russia. It seems that at this time there was fear of trouble with Russia. We have had since that the battle of the Dorking scare, the Fashoda scare, the scare about the Emperor William and the Boers. We have had lots of scares. It seems that the British people

must have these scares, that they enjoy them just as some people enjoy ill health. It looks as if in the old country the scare-mongers or perhaps the yellow journalists of the Harmsworth type were trying to bring about war. If so, no course which man can conceive would be more mete for reprobation. The men in Great Britain and elsewhere who are now alarmed will forget this panic and scare. Personally, I have not the slightest faith or belief in any ground for the panic or the scare. But the men who are in a frenzy are the descendants of the old sea dogs of the race of the old vikings who raised and flew the flag in every sea and planted it on every land. They were never too curious as to the number of their foes, but were ever and always anxious to know where they were to be found and fought.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver City).
Mr. Speaker, if instead of a navy Bill this were a Bill of attainder for the forfeiture of the estates and the corruption of the blood of the opposition members in this House, the speeches of the Prime Minister and his followers, and especially of the Prime Minister, would have been quite as apt and appropriate as they have been in relation to the question before this House. For myself, I had hoped that in the measureless importance of this question to Canada, in the intricacy of its many problems and in the necessary inexperience of this House in dealing with these problems, the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister would have found sufficient reasons and very cogent reasons for avoiding in his opening speech in this debate that regrettable exhibition of bitter party rancour and that regrettable display of a desire to whip this Bill through this House as a party measure, and not at all to treat it as a measure for the defence of our common country.

I cannot help thinking that the right hon. gentleman would have been better advised had he followed the non-partisan example set by the leader of the opposition, because then he would have been following the best traditions and the unvarying practice of the British House of Commons where questions of defence have always been placed far and away above and beyond all considerations of party politics. It would have been expected from the right hon. gentleman that he should set a high tone to this debate, but he did not see fit to do so. Instead, he directed the battery of his great rhetorical powers against the Conservative record, against the Conservative citadel. He fulminated and fretted and fumed at opposition silence; he trained his other guns, Krupp and Popp, upon the opposition. His followers, after his example, hurled their little party javelins and party missiles at our devoted heads on this