

of the present, this is not the case to-day. The French army is a powerful engine of war. Nothing that has happened in the history of the world would be so menacing to France as that Germany should command the sea and overcome Great Britain. And, whether she willed it or not—and I believe she would will it—she would be compelled to take sides with Great Britain. I do not say that Great Britain would need such assistance; I am speaking of what the hon. member for North Toronto said as on the subject of allies. It is true, Germany has the triple alliance, with Austria-Hungary and Italy. But what does that alliance mean? It is certain that Austria-Hungary can hardly be called a naval power; it has a very small navy, and its people are not a maritime people. Besides it has been known to every one who reads the political history of the times, that the dual empire holds together only by a thread. It is generally believed, and has been believed for long, that the existence of this empire largely depends upon the life of the present aged ruler. Then, the other member of the triple alliance, Italy. As was said on this floor recently, she is the wooden leg of the triple alliance. The policy was laid down years ago by Cavour that Italy should be the ally of Great Britain; and, through evil report and good report, Italy has followed out the policy of her great statesman. It can be relied upon, when it comes to a time of emergency, that Italy with her great coast and her extensive interests will maintain the policy that Cavour laid down and that has ever since been maintained, and that she will be found with Great Britain and not on the side of Austria-Hungary and Germany.

At six o'clock, House took recess

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WARBURTON. At six o'clock, I was referring to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when he was looking around to see how many allies Germany had and how few Great Britain possessed. I sought to show that in my opinion the facts were diametrically opposite to those which the hon. member stated, and that instead of Great Britain being practically without allies, she was really stronger in that respect than Germany was, and that without reference to Spain or any of the minor powers. Before parting with the hon. member for North Toronto, I wish to say a few words more in comment on his speech. He spent about three hours in a very eloquent address, nearly half of which was given to an effort to show why it was his party had made a change of base, and the other half

was given to the impossible task of trying to show that the right hon. the leader of the government was not loyal to Great Britain. I think the mere statement of that proposition refutes itself. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto, as usual with him, was very keen in his remarks, he indulged in sarcasms, he indulged in denunciations like those with which hon. members of this House are familiar. He denounced the leader of the government and everybody else except himself and his own friends. He also referred to a speech which he said had been delivered by the present premier of this country a great many years ago at the time of the North-west rebellion when, moved with indignation, he denounced the persons responsible for the shedding of blood in that rebellion. I do not know whether the Prime Minister ever spoke as he was reported or not; but I have no doubt that he was indignant, and very properly indignant. But although the hon. member for North Toronto has practically lived for so many years in an atmosphere of sarcasms, of sneers, of invective and of denunciations, until that atmosphere has almost become the breath of his nostrils, how is it then that he has not seen fit to use his great powers of invective against the men who were really guilty of the blood and waste of treasure which the country had to deplore on that occasion? Is it because the hon. member, despite his long experience in denunciation, could not find it in his heart to denounce himself?

We have had during this discussion many references to Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and what he said about a year ago. He has been quoted frequently. But Mr. McKenna has spoken since then. A year ago or thereabouts he was seeking to arouse the British parliament to the necessity of taking active steps in ship building and in strengthening the navy, in which effort he was supported by Sir Edward Grey. That work has been done, and there is now no danger so far as Great Britain is concerned. A short time ago Mr. McKenna, in reply to some of the articles that were written against him, took occasion to make these remarks:

At this moment Great Britain has got seven Dreadnoughts in commission. Germany has got two. When Germany has four in commission Great Britain will have ten, when Germany has five in commission Great Britain will have twelve, when Germany has nine in commission Great Britain will have fourteen, and when Germany has eleven in commission Great Britain will have sixteen, and when Germany has thirteen in commission Great Britain will have twenty. That carries us right up to March 31, 1912. Up to the present no programme in either country has gone beyond that period. Next year will see its own programme, and I have no doubt the figures will be equally satisfactory,