

in which England might be engaged. I never said anything of the kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that I would stop to consider whether a war in which England might be engaged would be just or unjust, but what I stated this afternoon and what I repeat, and what my hon. friend will have to consider himself, is that the condition of Great Britain and the condition of her daughter nations are absolutely different as to the causes of a war in which she might be engaged. England is engaged in all parts of Europe, all the time and almost every day considering whether or not the horizon is clear or is not clear. It has been the case in the past and no doubt in the future she will be engaged upon some kind of petty, war or a war perhaps of more or less importance in which we can have no interest at all, but in which we should have a very considerable interest. I cited the war in the Crimea this afternoon, and I cited also the war in Egypt. These were wars in which England was engaged and in which in my humble judgment, we would have absolutely no interest and take no part. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says that the Canadian navy should be at all times part of the imperial navy. Well, I repeat if my hon. friends on the other side entertain this view, I have no fault to find, but I do not share that view. This is the point of issue with my hon. friend. He admits that there might be a war in which we would have to take no part. The strength of the case is such that he had to make such an admission, and it is an admission that is patent to everybody that England might be engaged in a war in a part of the world in which the Canadian organized force would have no reason to take any part at all. It is possible that a case might arise in which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House might consider we should take part and in which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House might think we should take no part. I gave the case of the Crimean war and I was taken to task for that. I was told it was disloyal on my part because I stated that Canada would have no reason to take part in any war such as the Crimean war. That is a point on which we might differ. A more glaring case was the case of the Egyptian war. The British government sent a fleet, an act of war, to Alexandria, and it bombarded Alexandria. Will any one tell me in this House that Canada should have taken part in such a war?

Mr. LENNOX. Sure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well I say no, and there we are in conflict. My good friend (Mr. Lennox) says we should take part in such a war. I say on this side

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

of the House that we should not take part in such a war, and who is to judge as to whether we shall, or shall not. If we take the true Tory view maintained by my friend (Mr. Borden) that a Canadian navy should be part of the imperial navy under all circumstances, my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) would be right. But if we take the other view, that we should not act mechanically on this question, but that we have a right to judge for ourselves whether it is or is not in our interests that we should take part in a war, then of course of necessity we must have the control in our own hands. Sir, there is only one question upon this point. The Canadian people have an aversion to war. The Canadian people will not be drawn lightly into war, and the Canadian people will not be drawn into such a war as my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) thinks they should be drawn. But the Canadian people will under all circumstances gladly go into a war when the supremacy of Great Britain is in peril. How is that to be determined? There is only one way of determining those questions, and it is by the will of the government, the will of parliament, and the will of the people.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There is a middle course that suggests itself to me, and it may be the way that will be worked out practically. While we may not specifically put in this Act of parliament that automatically the Canadian navy is a part of the British navy, we can by a temporary Act of the government, or by an order in council declare that the navy may for the time being be considered as a part of the British navy. That would give this government an opportunity to revise the situation. As a matter of fact I believe that is the way it will be worked out, that when England is at war, a temporary order in council will be issued saying that the navy is to be considered a part of the British navy. It appears to me that it will work out in that way, namely, that Canada can keep control of her navy by setting out in the statute that it shall not automatically be part of the British navy, but that it can by temporary order in council be made a portion of the British navy.

Mr. BURRELL. I must confess that after listening to this debate, and particularly to the Prime Minister's remarks it has become exceedingly difficult to know whether this navy is to be one of the empire or one solely for Canada. That is one impression. I must say that the contentions of the Prime Minister seem to be absolutely untenable if the Canadian navy is to fly the Union Jack. I cannot understand, I do not think any man in this side of this House, can understand how a Canadian war vessel can fly the