

for British connections. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) cannot find any authority for attributing that statement to Sir Charles Tupper. The hon. gentleman made another reference to Sir Charles Tupper, and that was that Sir Charles had written a letter to the leader of the opposition asking him to support the naval policy of the First Minister. But what Sir Charles Tupper said in that letter was:

I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons, which pledged parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of a Canadian navy and to support England in every emergency.

That was the recommendation made by Sir Charles Tupper, and instead of this government following that recommendation they have departed from it in its first essential 'in every emergency.' Gentlemen on the other side have complained that in connection with this question the charge of graft has been levelled against them, but I will read the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) who, if not a minister, is an embryo minister, and we will see from it the plane on which he puts the establishment of a Canadian navy. The hon. member for Pictou said:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the object of this government in proposing this policy is that this navy is to be constructed in Canada, by Canadian workmen, in Canadian workshops, and that it is to be a Canadian navy, primarily for the defence of Canadian interests.

And this afternoon the member for the Yukon told us that the only redeeming feature of the navy was that it would lead to the construction of these ships in Canada. There is no spirit of patriotism in such remarks, none whatever. Every sentence of every speech delivered from the government benches so far enunciates the maxim of la Bruyère: that under a corrupt government there is no such thing as patriotism, its place being supplied by private interest, public fame, and devotion to a chief. That is what we see on the other side of the House. No nation would engage in war unless fairly certain she is going to win, and if the British empire wants to preserve her position unscathed before the world she is in duty bound to prepare for war. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that the plans of Germany are directed towards obtaining colonies; the member for the Yukon told us that Germany wants to obtain them by peace, but the real fact is that Germany wants to obtain them in her own way: by blood and iron. Canada has a duty in this crisis, and Canada's duty is to be ready by sea and land to defend the mother country. In this con-

Mr. HUGHES.

nection, I may refer to an incident which occurred in the Franco-Prussian war. The French rifle in 1870 was superior to the German rifle, and although the French rifle far out-ranged the German rifle, a prominent German officer who led his corps at the battle of Weissembourg, declared that while his men came under the French fire at 1,700 yards, yet between 1,700 and 600 yards not one man was struck by a French bullet, which went to show that at the beginning of the war the French were bad shots. Later on they became better trained, and in the succeeding battles they gave a better account of themselves. In the American civil war the southern soldiers, who were excellent shots, although armed with muzzle-loading rifles, made it absolutely impossible for the northern army to advance on their position. In Canada, and the other colonies of the empire, are to be found expert shots, who, when they come to the assistance of Britain, I am satisfied will more than give a good account of themselves in any struggle in which they may take part. The hon. member for the Yukon, in his address, compared the militia law of this country with the naval law, but he forgot that there was an essential difference between the mobilization of the militia and the mobilization of the navy. It is good old English law that parliament should be called when war is declared, and that is a good sound principle in Canadian law so far as the militia is concerned. In the Franco-Prussian war it took weeks before the German army could be mobilized, although it was supposed to be the best organized army in the world, and there was plenty of time to call parliament, and as a matter of fact the German parliament was called. In the case of our militia it, of course, would take some time to mobilize them, and it is quite right that parliament should be summoned when the militia is called out, and there would be plenty of time to do that. But in the case of a naval war the clash comes like a lightning flash. A war may break out to-day and a German ship may be in some harbour, or lying outside the three mile limit, and the music begins at once. So that a navy must of necessity always be ready to take the sea for active service, whereas an army and a militia are not necessarily in the same position.

Let me draw a contrast between the two policies. The government claim that they are adhering to the resolution passed last year, whereas we take the position that they are not carrying that resolution out in any essential point. The policy of the leader of the opposition provides immediate help. In furnishing two Dreadnoughts, it gives the necessary security, whereas the policy of the government is