

tradiictory nature. Why, Sir, it is evident to every one that my hon. friend's resolution was conceived for the purpose of consolidating conflicting elements within his own party. One element of the opposition says we ought to send a contribution equal to the value of two Dreadnoughts to meet a crisis, and the leader of the opposition had to provide for that feeling. Another man thought it would be a foolish thing to build a navy in Canada under any circumstances, and my hon. friend had to make some provision in his policy for that feeling. A third contingent thought that before building a navy in Canada we ought to consult the electors of this country as to whether we should do it or not, and my hon. friend had to make provision for that feeling. So there are three positively divergent principles that had to be worked into one symmetrical whole, and he endeavours to combine into one party different men of all these different temperaments. And so we have the simple expedient of the hon. gentleman's resolution to combine the conflicting elements among his own followers.

Now, the proposition of giving two Dreadnoughts, or a contribution of money, to the British empire is based on the assumption that there is a crisis. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) wanted to know what I proposed to do in case of a crisis. I will ask him another question. How are we to determine whether there is a crisis or not in Britain? By what process of reasoning are the members of this House to arrive at an assurance that there is a crisis at the seat of empire? Because every member of this House will agree with me that we must not be carried away by every little wave of sentiment that comes along. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), and the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), could get up an excitement of that kind in 24 hours. Now, Sir, if it should ever happen that hon. gentlemen opposite took the reins of government in this country, and if I myself became leader of the opposition, I can imagine that these hon. gentlemen would be wanting to send Dreadnoughts every 48 hours in order to meet an imagined emergency, and I would have to oppose them.

Now, I submit that the question of whether a crisis exists is to be determined by some reasonable process. The leader of the opposition said we must determine whether there is a crisis in Britain by the statements of responsible men in England. In that I agree with my hon. friend. But can my hon. friend, or any other man of this House, conclude that there is a crisis, or a serious danger, from the statements of responsible men in England? I may be told, how is it that the Liberal government

in England, for the last two years, and especially the last year, have been increasing the power of the British navy; and according to the despatches received in this country yesterday, the speech from the Throne, at the meeting of the British parliament, asks for a further increase in the provision for strengthening the navy. Well, Sir, I look upon all that as an evidence, not of a crisis, not of danger, but of a determination to secure absolute security. It is not an evidence that Britain is going to be interfered with by Germany, it is an evidence that neither Germany nor any other country will dare to interfere with the integrity of that great empire. The question as to whether there is a crisis should be decided by members of this House, in view of the policy, the statements and the actions of responsible ministers in the old country. I want to read one or two short extracts from the columns of one of the most responsible newspapers in England. As an Englishman I take a great interest in the press of that country, in the news which it publishes, and in the intelligent expression of public opinion which we may seek in its columns. Here is an article commenting on the present policy of the government, and of the leader of the opposition on the question now before the House. I think the House will agree that this is one of the most responsible newspapers published in the city of London, and the article from which I propose to quote discusses the very conditions that we are now considering to-day. The statements that this paper makes have an important bearing upon this question. Let me read the article for the benefit of my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo, who is alarmed about this crisis. I know that my hon. friend will appreciate the sentiments that come from the source that I am about to mention. I refer to the London 'Spectator' for January 15, 1910, which says:

The conviction of the indivisibility of the empire, which grows deeper and more earnest in the British dominions as time passes, and as one significant event gives place to another, was nobly expressed in the speeches of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Borden on Wednesday, when a Bill for creating a Canadian navy was introduced in the Canadian House of Commons. We have always maintained that the colonies ought not to be harassed into making contributions to the British navy; that an empire which is to have any reality cannot be maintained by pressure from the centre on the circumference, but must exist and flourish by the spontaneous desire of all the different parts to remain in a fixed relation to the mother country by accepting the implied obligations.

Let me read another passage from the same editorial:

Last April it was reported that Victoria and New South Wales would combine to give