

thinking of the present government. That veteran statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, once the pride and strength of the Conservative party, has given unqualified adhesion to our policy. Need I say more? If there is an imperialist of the imperialists now living, it is Lord Milner. Lord Milner was here last fall, and you will pardon me, Sir, if I recall to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite what were the opinions of Lord Milner upon this question. In Vancouver he spoke as follows:

I have said that Canada is not unique in being a great country. But she is unique in being one of a group of countries, which has a strong foothold in every corner of the world. That group only needs to hold together and to be properly organized, in order to command, with a comparatively small cost to its individual members, all the credit and all the respect, and, therefore, all the power and all the security which credit and respect alone can give a nation among the nations of the world. No doubt Canada, if she is to take her place in such a union, will have to develop, as I believe she will desire to develop, her own fighting strength. But not to a greater extent than would be necessary in any case for the adequate development of Canadian self-respect, or beneficial to the manhood of her people, and certainly nothing like to the same extent as would be absolutely inevitable if she desired to stand alone.

Again at Toronto he made use of language even more significant:

But no doubt the general position would be much stronger if all the self-governing states were to adopt the course which Australia seems disposed to adopt of creating a national militia, and laying the foundations of a fleet. And I for one should welcome such a policy, wherever adopted, not as affording relief to the United Kingdom, but as adding to the strength and dignity of the empire as a whole, its influence in peace as well as to its security in case of war.

It is not a question of shifting burdens, but of developing fresh centres of strength. For this reason I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and navy of the United Kingdom, though as evidences of a sense of the solidarity of the empire such contributions are welcome, and valuable, pending the substitution of something better. But I am sure that the form which imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take, and ought to take, the form at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union, is the development of their several defensive resources, in material and in manhood. I know that it may be argued—it has been argued—that individual strength would make for separation. But I have no sympathy whatever with that point of view.

Later he goes on:

The profession and technical, not to say the strategic, arguments for a single big navy of the empire are enormously strong, so strong that they might conceivably overcome, as

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

they have to some extent overcome in the past, the political objection. But without wishing to be dogmatic on a subject which requires a great deal more careful study on all hands than it has yet received, I must say that, speaking as an imperialist, I feel the political objection very strongly.

If the self-governing states were going, under our present constitutional arrangements, merely to contribute to a central navy, whether in money or better still, in men and ships. I do not think they would take that interest and pride in the matter which it is essential they should take. They would continue, as now, absorbed in their local affairs, and, even if they felt their obligation to the empire as a whole, they would rest content to have discharged it by such a contribution. The contribution, under these circumstances, would probably not be large, but that is not really the weakest point in such a system. Its fatal weakness is that the participation of the self-governing states in imperial affairs would begin and end with the contribution.

Now, Sir, from all this I think I can safely conclude that the true policy which should be followed, even from the primary point of view of the British empire, is not a contribution, but the development of our naval strength, as we contemplate to do under this Bill.

This point being settled, I now come to another which has been a source of strong objection made against us, that is to say, who should have control of our navy. Upon this point I stated the other day that the parliament of Canada would have control of the navy, and would declare when it should or should not go into war. Upon this point we have been assailed right and left, assailed in Quebec and assailed in Ontario. We have been assailed in Quebec because there it is said that under no circumstances should Canada ever take part in any war of England, assailed in Ontario, because there it is said that under all circumstances Canada should take part in all the wars of England. The position which we take is that it is for the parliament of Canada, which created this navy, to say when and where it shall go to war. The other day when introducing this measure, I stated that when England is at war we are at war. In saying that I have shocked the minds and the souls of many of our friends in Quebec.

Some men tore their hair and their garments as if I had uttered blasphemy, as if I had uttered some new and fatal proposition which never had been heard before. The truth is that in making the statement that when England is at war we are at war, I was simply stating a principle of international law. It is a principle of international law that when a nation is at war all her possessions are liable to attack. If England is at war she can be attacked in Canada, in Australia,