

factory. Then, Sir, consider it from the point of view of desertions. There is not a single desertion mentioned in the report of 1911, while in the report of 1912, one hundred and forty-nine desertions are said to have taken place after the people had lost confidence in the service due to hon. gentlemen opposite being returned to power. May I say, with all respect, to the Minister of Marine that before he undertakes to enlighten this House upon any branch of the Naval Service again he should read the records of his own department, become familiar with them, and not impose on the members of the Opposition the duty of refuting him from documents contained in the archives of his own office.

Up to the time the hon. member for Calgary rose to address this House yesterday afternoon, silence had long reigned supreme on the Government side, and I am bound to say that so far as the naval question is concerned that silence continued during the greater part of the hon. gentleman's three hours speech. Perhaps the mental attitude of the House with regard to the hon. gentleman's speech could be best illustrated by a story. An Irishman on a dark and stormy night lost his way on a dangerous mountain side. The rain was falling in torrents, the thunder pealed and the lightning flashed; below him ran a torrent swollen to its fullest dimensions by the downpour, and one misstep meant the man's doom. He picked his way slowly, painfully and in fear from rock to rock with the greatest care and the greatest difficulty. Finally, unable to make any headway against the storm, he stopped and, joining his hands in prayer, raised his eyes and exclaimed: 'O Lord, more light and less noise.' The first time the hon. member for Calgary spoke in this House, my right hon. friend and leader referred to his torrential eloquence. That was in full play yesterday afternoon and last night. He went from one imaginative flight to another, in a continuous crescendo scale, until he finally imagined himself to be His Majesty the King, and, in consonance with that character, he styled our friends from the province of Quebec as 'my French Canadian subjects.' When he reached that pinnacle, Mr. Speaker, I could not help thinking of the historic tilt between Gladstone and Disraeli, in the course of which one of the gladiators referred to the other as 'a man inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity.' My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) attended to the member for Calgary. The darts of the hon. member for Red Deer pierced the political armour of the member for Calgary at every point, and I

can do no more than drive those darts a little farther home.

Near the close of his speech, the hon. member for Calgary said that the difference between the two parties on this naval question is fundamental. I quite agree with him, and that is about the only thing he said with which I do agree. The difference is fundamental; on one side there is involved the principle of local autonomy, on the other, centralization, and by that difference we on this side of the House are prepared to stand or fall.

Again, in referring to the resolution of March 29, 1909, the hon. gentleman declared that he and his friends had said that they would not support that resolution because it meant an independent navy. This was a surprise to a great many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and if my hon. friend were here now, I would ask him when they made that declaration. No one made it in this House on March 29, 1909; everybody was then in favour of the resolution. It was not made in April, 1909, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he delivered his speech in Toronto and stood by the resolution. It was not made on July 1, 1909, when the then leader of the Opposition, the present Prime Minister, made a speech in London, and still stood by that resolution. It was not made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce at Halifax in August, 1909, when he made a speech in that city, during the course of which he still declared his adherence to the resolution. Neither was it made by the then leader of the Opposition when he returned from London and spoke at Halifax in October, 1909, and still declared his warm adherence to the resolution. When, then, did this party use the language attributed to it by the hon. member for Calgary? He has not given us the date; he is not here now to enlighten us, but may I suggest, as I stated in this House last session, that the first occasion upon which that view was taken was when the present master of the Administration, the Minister of Public Works, suggested to his present colleagues the political advantage that might be gained by breaking faith with Parliament and the country and departing from the terms of the resolution of March 29, 1909.

The hon. member for Calgary also said that this is not a permanent policy of contribution. If as the hon. gentleman opposite say, we can neither build ships in Canada nor find recruits for them, what else, I ask them, can there be but a policy of contributions? On December 5th last the Prime Minister said that nothing of an efficient character could be built up in a quarter or perhaps half a century. Yesterday afternoon, when that language was