

navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

The point to which I wish to call attention is this. How can you reconcile these two sections? In the one, the command in chief of Canada's naval forces is vested in the King; and in the other, the Governor in Council may place that force at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in case of an emergency.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is an attempt to take away a power that belongs exclusively to the imperial government.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think it is. But in connection with the British North America Act, I would like to quote a passage from the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in which it seems to me there is more pregnancy than in anything I have heard for some time. This is what my hon. friend said about the British North America Act:

When the British empire is dissolved, the British North America Act goes also, and with it there departs every constitutional guarantee it contains. All beyond is chaos and darkness. What may be evolved out of that chaos and darkness, what constitutional status, what final relations, what ultimate balance of conflicting forces, no one of us today is bold enough to prophesy or wise enough to foresee.

Could there be more wisdom put into a dozen lines than our hon. leader has put into these words. I have stated my views in opening my address. I have stated why I believe we should have one united navy, an imperial navy, under one head. I believe that is the only way, I believe it is the cheapest way—if you want to bring the question down to a commercial plane—I believe it is the safest way to protect our trade routes and consolidate our great country. But these gentlemen opposite seem to dwell upon this aspect of the question. We on this side have done our best to convince them. I have no hope of doing more, than has been done, or even as much as has been done, by many on this side to convince our friends opposite that there is an emergency. Of course, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that England is arming, France is arming, Austria is arming—all the countries are arming to the limit. Why? For fear they will be attacked—not that they are going to attack anybody else, but for fear somebody else will attack them. Carry that argument to its logical conclusion and what can that conclusion be, but that we should strengthen the imperial navy, because we fear, and have good reason to fear, that Germany in the near future is going to attack us? I intend to

quote—what has been quoted before—from some of the men who believe that there is an emergency. For, we do not need to look very deeply into the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite to see that their strongest point against procuring Dreadnoughts is that there is no emergency. I find that men like Lord Rosebery, Sir Edward Grey, the right hon. Reginald McKenna, the right hon. Alfred Lyttleton, right hon. Mr. Balfour, right hon. Mr. Asquith—men of all shades of politics on the other side of the ocean—have told us that there is an emergency. I shall not quote here to-day anything that was said by these men during the election campaign in Britain which has recently been concluded. I admit that some of them have made statements during that campaign not wholly in accord with statements of theirs which I shall read. But these later statements, it must be remembered, were made during the heat of one of the strongest political campaigns ever carried on in Great Britain. I shall not quote at length, but shall give only paragraphs that are directly to the point. Lord Rosebery, speaking at the Imperial Press Conference in June last, three months before the House of Commons closed, said:

Now gentlemen, you will forgive me if I come next and at once to what is by far the most vital topic that you will have to discuss at this conference, or which concerns our empire as a whole—I mean that of imperial defence. . . . All, then, forbodes peace—

He says there is peace.

—and yet, at the same time, combined with this total absence of all question of friction, there never was, in the history of the world, so threatening and overpowering a preparation for war. That is the sign which I regard as most ominous. . . . I admit there are features of this general preparation for war which must cause special anxiety to the friends of Great Britain and of the British empire.

Certainly, Lord Rosebery remains under a feeling of anxiety. It is true the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) and others of hon. gentlemen opposite do not feel anxious. But I have no right to regard these gentlemen as of the same authority in this matter as Lord Rosebery and others whom I have named. These hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that there is no danger, but the great men in England tell us that there is danger.

When I see one country alone asking for 25 millions of extra taxation for warlike preparations; when I see the unprecedented sacrifices which are asked from us on the same grounds, I do begin to feel uneasy as to the outcome of it all, and to wonder where it will stop. . . . Gentlemen, we can and we