

hood of her, people, and certainly nothing like to the same extent as would be absolutely inevitable if she desired to stand alone.

And a little later, in a speech delivered in Toronto, he made use of language even more significant:

But no doubt the general position would be much stronger if all the self-governing states were to adopt the course which Australia seems disposed to adopt of creating a national militia, and laying the foundations of a fleet. And I for one should welcome such a policy, wherever adopted, not as affording relief to the United Kingdom, but as adding to the strength and dignity of the Empire as a whole, its influence in place as well as to its security in case of war.

It is not a question of sifting burdens, but of developing fresh centres of strength. For this reason, I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and navy of the United Kingdom, though as evidences of a sense of the solidarity of the Empire such contributions are welcome and valuable, pending the substitution of something better. But I am sure that the form which Imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take, and ought to take, the form at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states, and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union, is the development of their several defensive resources, in material and in manhood.

You have then the opinion of a man who, in my sense, is worthy of the consideration of this Government. I believe the suggestions made by Lord Milner, when passing through Canada, ought to be taken into consideration, that the best way to come to the aid of the British Empire is not in voting a contribution to the Imperial treasury, but resides in the organization of a navy similar to that of Australia, and such as Canada ought to have, not only for land defence but also for the organization of a naval militia.

Such an affirmation, as I was saying a moment ago, ought to incite the Government to think it over and to adopt the policy approved by this Parliament at the time of the adoption of the resolution of the 29th of March, 1909, and which was put into practice by the naval law of 1910.

But there is a most important reason which makes the Government deviate from the right path.

It is that, in 1911, we have had general elections, and twenty-two of those who now constitute the majority of the Government have been elected by pledging themselves to have the naval law of 1910 revoked, and even by proclaiming themselves adverse to any aid to the British Empire, their claim being that Canada owed nothing to England and that the only thing we had to do was to remain in the statu quo.

I have no doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that an arrangement has been concluded between the Government and those twenty-

two members, and that the reason we hear no longer about a Canadian navy and that mention is only made of a contribution, is due to the fulfilling of a part of the conditions of that arrangement. But, Mr. Speaker, we are bound to admit that, sometime later, the Government will announce a permanent policy. What can that permanent policy be, if not a contribution, or a Canadian navy?

The principle reason given for that contribution is the fear of an attack by Germany against England; a very foolish reason, because, where would be the interest of Germany in waging war against England, with the prospect of being defeated? None whatever, as you can see, Mr. Speaker; and in the first place, if we take the reports coming from the best sources, what do we read there? Let me read you a report I find in *La Patrie*, of Montreal, now an ultra-Conservative organ, and which puts forth its best zeal in the interest of the Government:

We are advised from well-informed sources that Germany and England are on the point of concluding a double agreement, one referring to the naval constructions of both countries and the other to the Portuguese colony of Angola. According to this last agreement, the British Government would desist from its interests in that colony for the benefit of Germany. England would therefore authorize Germany to acquire that Portuguese colony of western Africa, on the reserve of the consentment of the Portuguese Government.

It was Baron Marshall who opened the first negotiations, and it was Prince Lichnowski who concluded them.

The rumour of that agreement about Angola was put in circulation about the end of last week. But at the time, in political circles no information could be available.

It is easy to see, Mr. Speaker, that Germany is not so anxious to go to war against England as people are led to believe.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a certain element both in England and in Germany, which is interested in having people believe in a future war and which forced the great powers into incurring enormous expenses for their armaments. Those people are the manufacturers of implements of war, who hope thereby to be able to realize profits in stocks which are generally known as water stocks. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many of those stocks there are? Let me tell you, because I have here on hand the necessary figures. The *Globe*, quoting the Morning Leader of London, has published on the 8th of August the following table, which gives the capitalization, at the end of 1909, of the six principal English companies engaged in the building of war ships and in the manufacture of arms:

	Shares.	Deben- tures. 1
Vickers-Maxim	£5,200,000	£2,956,200
Cammell-Laird	2,372,895	1,727,511
Armstrong-Whitworth . . .	4,210,000	2,500,000