

a Dreadnought, but upon consideration they preferred not to divert any money from their policy—which has been under consideration for a good many years—of having an Australian navy. The decision of Canada was understood also to be in favour of a local navy, but nothing definite was known till Sir Wilfrid Laurier made his statement on Wednesday. The man would be ungraceful and unromantic, indeed, who could read without pride and intense appreciation the language in which the scheme was discussed, or without feeling convinced that, whatever vicissitudes may follow, a movement has been begun which is bound to go on from strength to strength. . . . It is quite impossible now that there should be any return on the part of Great Britain to the principle adopted by the Imperial Defence Committee in 1906. The Imperial Defence Committee then disapproved of the Australian proposal to maintain a local navy. It acted on the advice of the admiralty, which was to the effect that an efficient navy is one and indivisible, that small local navies with independent characteristics could not be readily absorbed into the Royal navy in an emergency, and that the best assistance which the dominions could give to the mother country would be regular contributions of money. Canada and Australia, in their different degrees, have rejected that advice; and though we quite see the logic of the admiralty point of view, we think on the whole that Canada and Australia have decided wisely. There are two chief objections to the policy of naval tributes. One is that the British tax-payer would be tempted to reward them as made in relief of his own pocket.

My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo can appreciate that statement.

He would forget that the co-operation of the colonies in naval defence is intended to make assurance doubly sure. The other is that the colonists themselves would take infinitely less interest in imperial defence if they simply put down sums of money to be spent invisibly in Great Britain, instead of having navies of their own taking shape under their eyes, manned by their own people, and perhaps built in their own yards.

I submit that as the soundest, the most intelligent and the most independent advice that has been given by any newspaper in Great Britain during the consideration of this question. With regard to the condition of excitement that is sought to be created, and with regard to an emergency contribution for Dreadnoughts I find this statement in another English paper:

What is the 'emergency'? It is nothing more than the superheated six pence a word rant of a Socialist agitator, backed by the prestige of the greatest living journalistic acrobat and mountebank—chief press agent of the Unionist party—Lord Northcliffe.

These two dangerous demagogues have played the strings of the war harp so clamorously and persistently, they have for political purposes so basely misrepresented the naval strength of England and exaggerated that of Germany, that half the nation believes Britain is in danger, and excitable Canadians

Mr. RALPH SMITH.

have already begun to shout for a lifeline. This is to take the form of an 'emergency contribution.'

Here is a statement of Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, in answer to the ravings of Blatchford. Britain has now seven Dreadnoughts in commission, Germany has two; when Germany has four Britain will have ten, when Germany has five Britain will have twelve, when Germany in two years will have thirteen Britain will have twenty. He concludes by saying: '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.'

I have also a statement from Mr. John Burns, a responsible minister, who ought to be taken by the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo as a greater authority than Robert Blatchford. Both the hon. members for Yale-Cariboo and Kootenay endeavoured to prove to this House the existence of a condition of alarm and emergency in the old country by the writings of Robert Blatchford—Robert Blatchford, the paid agitator of Tory politicians, the gentleman who for years was willing to write for pay on one side and to write for pay on the other. An hon. gentleman who mentions the name of Robert Blatchford as a British subject and as an evidence of the existence of a crisis in Great Britain cannot believe in the principle of self-government in a country like Canada. Is there any man willing to destroy the principle of responsible government, and to send a contribution of \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 to Great Britain at the instigation of Robert Blatchford? Yet, Robert Blatchford was held up to us as the authority to whom we must look for a true statement of the condition of Great Britain to-day. The hon. gentlemen were willing to accept a reason of that kind believing, that as far as Blatchford was concerned, they could find a good reason; at any rate, once every forty-eight hours. Mr. John Burns says in effect exactly what I am saying now.

I shall not take time to read some extracts from speeches by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) a year ago. He has set himself against the policy of establishing a Canadian navy. When I was thinking this thing out, I said to myself: I wonder if I could not commit a few extracts from this hon. gentleman's speech to memory.

Mr. HUGHES. You could not get anything better.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has stated the literal truth for once, in favour of a Canadian navy, we could not get anything better. What was the position taken by the leader of the opposition ten months ago? We know his position now, what was it ten months ago? Let me remind the Minister of Militia that