

giving absolute security to this country with regard to subsequent years. These are the facts, given you on official authority, and I think they are sufficient to substantiate the claim of the government that everything has been done with regard to the construction of these great ships. I have not referred to ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnoughts. We have an overwhelming superiority in that class of ships. The navy scare has not the slightest foundation in fact.

Then he goes on to say that it is grossly untrue to say that in two years Germany would have ten Dreadnought docks to Britain's three. As a matter of fact, Britain has at the present time twelve Dreadnought docks, and in two years time she will have sixteen, as compared with Germany's nine. So that if we take the well weighed words of the First Lord of the Admiralty spoken quite recently, I think we may safely conclude that so far as human knowledge can go, the British navy is quite prepared to meet the German navy, or any other enemy that may come along. Sir Edward Grey recently made the following remarks:

The British navy is being maintained in a position to protect the country against any probable combination of fleets.

With the utterances of these responsible statesmen I think we may fairly content ourselves. We have heard much praise given to New Zealand and Australia for offering Dreadnoughts. I do not wish to belittle those dominions, I would give them all the credit to which they are entitled. I had occasion last session to look up the debt of New Zealand, and I find that she then owed \$345 per head for every man, woman and child in the country, and she was getting into debt at the rate of \$10 or \$15 per head every year, right straight along. I have not seen the New Zealand Year-book since the one I saw last year, but it is safe to assume that if she has been going on at the same rate, her debt is now at least \$365 per head. I have not been able to find what the debt of Australia is since the Commonwealth was organized, or whether they have any as a commonwealth. But knowing as we do that the Australian, as well as the New Zealanders are a very progressive people in the way of running into debt, it would be a marvel, indeed, if Australia had not run up a considerable debt during the eight years of her existence as a united commonwealth. But the states of that commonwealth in the aggregate owe £57 10s. sterling for every man, woman and child of their population, and I do say that while it is nice for New Zealand and Australia to be furnishing Dreadnoughts and offering to furnish more if necessary, it may not be equally as nice for those who lend them the money. It is true that Australia sent a Dreadnought, but she went to England to

Mr. WARBURTON.

borrow the money. It is one satisfaction to England, that she will have New Zealand's note and New Zealand will have the protection of the Dreadnought.

Then again in view of the facts as they now exist in the world, as far as we can judge, in view of what has been said by responsible British statesmen quite recently, the question must arise: Is there any reason whatever for this gift of \$25,000,000, is it needed? Especially with the great preponderance in Britain's favour of tonnage, ships, guns, and men, an average of five to two all around, there does not appear to be any such need. In this connection, I would like to read an extract from a letter which I received on Saturday from a gentleman who was twice elected to this House in the Conservative interest, and who also contested the seat which I now have the honour to hold with Sir Louis Davies, a gentleman who has always been a strong Conservative, who is, I may say, the great source of strength to the opposition in the county from which I come, a gentleman who has such strength that if he were to withdraw his opposition to the government candidates and give them his support, or even to withdraw his opposition without supporting them, the path of the government candidates at the next general election would be rendered very smooth. I am referring to Dr. John T. Jenkins, formerly a member of this House, who wrote me as follows, under date of February 15:

With regard to the Navy Bill, I say frankly I don't see the need for it at present, but as to Borden's resolution to give 25 or 30 millions to England (now when the German war squall, it was a hysterical squall, all screeching and kicking without any foundation, is over), I see nothing but lunacy in it. If we are to have a navy I am heartily in favour of the government policy. If we build here the money remains in the country and we get the good of it, but if we give millions to England, it is gone, and gone for ever. There is talk of a dissolution over it. If so you may say I will go against Borden's policy and support the government with all my force, and I think I have a little left. I feel very strongly over this matter. I never thought to change my politics (there is little to change now, anyway), but to fool away millions that England does not want and that we need most seriously in the development of our resources is, to my mind, the worst kind of folly.

Mr. Jenkins is becoming an old man now, but in his early manhood he served in the Crimea and has the British and Turkish medals.

The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) delivered an eloquent two-hour speech the other evening to which I listened with great interest, as I do to all of his eloquent addresses. While listening to him I could not help recalling a passage