

lieutenant, give reasons why, what they believed absolutely in 1909 and what they tried to make everybody else believe in, was false and foolish and absolutely unthinkable in the year of Our Lord 1912. Facts are facts. The conditions which existed in 1909, exist in 1912 as far as the mutual obligations of Canada and the Empire are concerned. There has been no change of circumstance so far as these relations are concerned that would warrant or justify in any degree the change of front that has been made by the right hon. the leader of the Government and his lieutenant, by the gentlemen who are behind them and by their press in the country. There is no change of conditions to warrant this change of front and I hope I will not be considered to be out of order if I suggest that it is the result not of a change of military or naval conditions, but of political exigency in the United Kingdom on the one hand and in the Dominion of Canada on the other.

I take the liberty of suggesting that in the United Kingdom, where a Liberal government is in power, it is the part of their opponents to take up the same parrot cry as our friends on this side. Whatever the Liberal Government may do, it either does not do enough or it does not do it right; and our respected Premier has apparently allowed himself to be used by the party of the opposition in Great Britain in their campaign against the Government of Great Britain. It is a notorious fact that the Opposition party in Great Britain are demanding more dreadnoughts from the Government, and that every time a proposal is made by any of the outside dominions—and some of these proposals that have come through to the press are bona fide and some are only fakes—every time such a proposal is made the cry goes forth that the Liberal Government of Great Britain was not doing its duty by the Empire, or such a gift would not have been needed. Co-operation in defence between Canada and Great Britain is what both Canada and Great Britain need, but co-operation in politics between Canada and the United Kingdom is not to the interest of either Canada or the United Kingdom. It is not only political exigency across the water; there is political exigency on this side of the water, too.

It will be remembered that when the leader of the Liberal party inaugurated his naval policy, exception was taken to it not so much by the Prime Minister who was then the leader of the Opposition, as by his friend Mr. Henri Bourassa. And Mr. Bourassa and his colleague, Mr. Lavergne, and the gentlemen to the number of twenty-one who sit behind the Prime Minister to-day, and by their votes maintain him in office, took issue against the Laurier naval policy, because it embodied the principle of personal service to

Canada, and more, because it embodied the principle of personal service to the Empire. The fact that it was for the personal service of Canada did not excuse it in the minds of these twenty-one present supporters and exponents of Imperial loyalty to-day sitting behind the Prime Minister. Not to dwell too long on that point, I said there was a political exigency, and it resulted in a compromise between the Prime Minister and his followers—between the ultra-Imperial Prime Minister and his friends, and the anti-Imperial followers who keep him in office. And the compromise was, that whereas before the country—when they were canvassing in the parishes, when they were on the hustings asking for election—they were against the Canadian navy and they were against the contribution to the British navy; they were against anything in the form of assistance to maintain the naval supremacy of the Empire. But when it came to a question of the Prime Minister taking office, and to a question of these gentlemen getting office, and enjoying the patronage and authority that goes with office, then the Prime Minister was prepared to compromise on the principle that he himself laid down in this House only three years ago, and these twenty-one gentlemen were prepared to compromise on the principles that they claimed election from their constituents on. So they reached the point of agreeing, not unanimously, but in large part to support the principle of a contribution to the Imperial navy, providing and subject to the condition that the personal service of Canada or Canadians should be eliminated from the arrangement. And again, Sir, I say, this is done in the name of loyalty to the Empire.

I take the point in this House that the people of the country are entitled to know. That when the Government of the day cancelled the naval defence policy of their predecessors it became necessary for them to declare what policy they had to offer for Canadian or Imperial naval defence. They have had fourteen months to make up their minds. Is the question important? Surely the safety of the Empire is a sufficiently important question to engage the attention of these giant intellects during a period of fourteen months. On their own showing, this question is of such supreme importance that they are required by virtue of their office to present to this country a matured policy in regard to Canada's part in the defence of the Empire. Their excuse for not having done so, that they are providing for an emergency, at the present time is no longer a good excuse because there is no emergency. Therefore it is for them to say, and this country is entitled to know, what they propose to do. Is this Government