

CANADA FIRST AND KEENE EMPIRE POLICY

Will Control Our Own Fleet for Coast Defense and Empire Co-operation--Laurier Delivers Eloquent Speech--Borden Expounds Conservative Policy

OTTAWA, ONT., FEB. 3, 1910.—In a speech that for breadth of vision, masterful handling of fundamental principles on which the Empire is founded, eloquence and effectiveness, Sir Wilfrid Laurier today turned a page in Canadian history. He defined the policy of the government, looking to the creation of the Canadian navy in co-operation with the navy of the motherland, in a two hours address which will rank as a classic in the annals of the Canadian Parliament, which its conclusion was marked by the inspiring spectacle of the whole house rising and singing the national anthem. Sir Wilfrid has seldom, if ever, been heard to better advantage in the House. Touching first on the discordant and divergent views expressed by the various wings of the Opposition, following a unanimous endorsement of the resolution passed last session he drove home with incisive argument, the inconsistencies and anomalies of their opposing attitudes, and in a succinct and brilliant review of the whole course of the constitutional development in this country, and in the Empire at large he drew the logical and incontrovertible moral that the permanency and cohesion of the Empire depended upon the adherence to the basic principle of local autonomy in matters of defence as in all other matters over which the daughter states now asserted their right to self-government, while at the same time being bound to the mother land by ties of loyalty and devotion, made enduring because voluntary, and based upon the people's will. From the tale of the past he drew the moral as to the line along which the Empire must develop, and with compelling force he pointed to the weakness in the policies suggested from the other side of the house looking either to the outgoing policy of direct contribution of funds to be expended by the government outside of Canada, or to the policy of the other extreme of not meeting the duty now resting on the larger and richer Canada of fulfilling her responsibilities as a full grown partner and loyal daughter on the mother land.

He was followed by Mr. Borden, who despite the previous endorsement of the government's policy for the creation of a Canadian navy, and after months of hesitancy and shifting of the great issue now before the country, compelled evidently by the exigencies of pressure from within the party, finally threw overboard all previously declared convictions and cast in his lot with the ultra imperialists, who have been advocating a direct contribution as a temporary expedient to meet the alleged crisis in respect to the maintenance of British supremacy on the sea. He proposed the amendment advocating the gift in aid to Great Britain of an amount sufficient to construct two dreadnaughts, or about twenty million dollars leaving the permanent solution of the question of Canada's defence as a part of the Empire to be dealt with later after more mature consideration.

To both policies enunciated by Sir Wilfrid and Mr. Borden, the latter's first lieutenant, Mr. F. D. Monk, came out in unequivocal opposition. He took the extreme anti-imperial ground, declaring that Canada should hold aloof from any participation in the wars of Britain, and declared that the creation of a navy meant practically the giving up of the dominion's freedom and unrestricted autonomy.

At the outset Sir Wilfrid expressed his regret that the continued illness of Hon. Mr. Bredou had deprived the House of some of the keenest of its members, and care which the latter could give to the measure in its discussion before the House. Then in a preliminary to the discussion of the present situation in regard to the naval question, Sir Wilfrid gave a brief review of the attitude which had been maintained up to the present by the two parties in the House. In the present government and the Liberal party were concerned that question had arisen for the first time at the Imperial conference of 1902, when the subject of the country would automatically be considered. The discussion revealed the fact that there was a divergence of views between the British and the Colonial authorities. The secretary of state, Mr. Balfour, suggested that the Dominions beyond the seas should equip and maintain a body of troops for imperial service which in case of war would be turned over automatically to the War Office. Some of the Dominions agreed to this; others, including Australia and Canada, disagreed. The secretary for the Navy, suggested that the Dominions should contribute yearly to the maintenance and equipment of the Imperial navy. To this the ministers who represented Canada could not give their assent. They embodied their views in a state paper. In this it was stated that they recognized the obligation of Canada to relieve to a large extent in so far as the means of the country would allow the burden which had hitherto been on the shoulders of the English taxpayer alone. They declared that as Canada increased in wealth and population it would go further in the matter of defence, and that in everything undertaken in that direction, whatever might be done would be done in co-operation with the Imperial authorities, but always under the control and responsibility of Canadian authorities in accordance with their right to self-government in this as in all other matters.

This, Sir Wilfrid said, was eight years ago, and in that time the government had never deviated from its policy. This policy the government affirmed again at the Imperial conference of 1907 and again last year in the parliament when the question came up for concrete and immediate action. This policy is embodied in the bill now before the House and by this policy the government stands or falls. But Sir Wilfrid would not. This policy is the latest link in the long chain of events which followed from the principle laid down by reformers of old times, Baldwin and Lafontaine, and step by step, stage by stage, we have brought Canada to the position of a nation, but a nation that is not a nation, but a daughter of a nation within the British Empire. This policy is the full maturity of the rights asserted by the obligations assumed by Canada, which inspired the Imperial pact, when after Canada had given preference in her markets to the products of the mother country, to put in her mouth these words: "Daughter in my mother's home, but mistress in my own."

Proceeding, Sir Wilfrid said that if we adopt today this policy, if we put it in the form in which it is now before the country, it is because we say to the world that Canada is a nation, but a daughter of a nation of England. Such has been the strong and persistent course

of something upon which the bold lion from East Grey, Mr. Sproule, and gentle lamb from Jacques Cartier, Mr. Monk, rose and beat in unison. (Loud laughter.)

The task was a difficult one, and how far the committee succeeded we know by what took place within three weeks when this bill was introduced for the first time. Three members of the Opposition then spoke, and all three spoke differently. The leader of the Opposition agreed to the principle of the bill but thought it did not go far enough. Mr. Monk was opposed to this bill and everything of that kind. Mr. Jameson, though not very clear or sure of his ground, seemed to ask for a referendum.

The result of all this is plain. On the other side of the house we have the hostile attitude of the ultra imperialists represented by Mr. Monk. On the other hand we have the affirmative extremists, those who desire not a Canadian but an Imperial navy to be maintained by contributions from the self-governing dominions and those who believe that if we have a navy it should pass automatically in time of war into the hands of the admiralty, those who believe a navy is not sufficient and that we should have an emergency contribution. All these forms of opinion are simply different forms of respectable, though misguided, Imperialism.

CANADA FIRST.

If I may be permitted to speak of myself personally, I do not intend to be an Imperialist. Neither do I pretend to be an anti-Imperialist. I am a Canadian first, last and all the time. I am a British subject by birth, by tradition, by conviction, by the conviction that the Empire is the best my native land has found a measure of security and freedom which I could not have found under any other regime. I want to speak from that double standpoint, for our policy is an expression of that which has been said by me at once to those who differ from me, those who pretend to be Imperialists, those who pretend that the British Empire must be the first consideration, that in my judgment the policy which we should have is the policy of the house at this moment is a better keeping with the true spirit of principle of the British Empire was founded, upon which it exists and upon which it only can continue to exist.

Continuing, Sir Wilfrid traced in eloquent terms the development of British institutions from centralized autocracy to complete colonial self government. What is the principle, he asked, what is the inspiration, what is the one influence that has made the rebellion in Canada, what has brought Canada to the position that she occupies today? What is the principle, the inspiration which has made Australia what it is, which has made New Zealand what it is, which has made South Africa, torn by war only two years ago, is building up a nation under the British flag?

CONSERVATIVE DISUNION.

Sir Wilfrid, in contrast, referred to the Conservative policy, always divided in council and divided in action. Mr. Foster's resolution last session, he said, was interpreted by the Opposition as an endorsement of the policy of the government. However, Mr. Monk had told them that this motion had created some stir in the ranks of the party and that he could not support it.

Sir Wilfrid quoted the concluding sentences of Mr. Foster's address in moving his resolution last year declaring that the time had come when Canada should assume a greater share of the burden of the Imperial defense, but not specifying very clearly whether that contribution should be in the form of the creation of a Canadian navy or of a direct contribution.

A CHANGE OF BASE.

When this resolution was moved, said Sir Wilfrid, and accepted by unanimous vote we believed that it would be binding upon the other side of the house. But in this we made a mistake. It never entered our mind that the men on the other side of the house would go back on the vote they had solemnly given. We paid them too great a compliment. Three months has hardly elapsed when the terms of the resolution were attacked and challenged by the men who had voted for it, attacked in the press, attacked in conversation with reporters, attacked on public platforms.

NO TRIBUTE.

I need not say that this principle is one to which we on this side of the house cannot agree. We are told that the only way in which naval defense can be carried on is by contribution to the Imperial navy. I have to submit that this idea of contribution seems to me repugnant to the genius of our British institutions. It smacks too much of the tribute to be acceptable by British communities. That is not the true conception of the British Empire, the conception of new nations growing strong and wealthy, each developing itself along the lines of its own needs and conditions, but all joining in the

case of a common danger and from all points of the earth rushing upon the common foe.

But the point is no longer arguable. The point has been settled at last conference. Many and many a time upon the floor of this house and in the press of the country we have been assailed and our action has been contrasted with the action of Australia, who in 1902 agreed to give a contribution for the maintenance of the Imperial navy. But let us see what now is the position of Australia. She has abandoned the position taken in 1902 and has come to the position taken by Canada. Today she is building a fleet of her own. And there is something still more significant. It is not Australia who is paying a contribution to Great Britain, it is Great Britain who is paying a contribution to Australia for the Australian navy.

THE MAKE-UP OF THE FLEET.

In the composition of the fleet we have not had the good luck to satisfy the opposition. It has been said that we should have accepted the admiralty suggestion and have put our feet unit on the Pacific. Is there a man who will blame us because we would not agree? We have a large Atlantic fleet and must divide our force between the two oceans.

Then we are asked, why did you consent to such an insignificant navy as

the one which we propose? Well, we considered it prudent. Two ships were proposed. One was for a fleet of seven and the other for a fleet of eleven ships. The seven were to have been four Bristol, one Boscawen and six destroyers. Because we have to protect the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, and so divide our fleet, we thought it better to have eleven than seven ships. In this we acted on the advice of the admiralty. We are blamed that we are not to have an armored vessel of the Dreadnought type. Perhaps I can cite an authority which would satisfy the opposition. I could not give a more competent authority than Sir Charles Boscawen, who is as good a seaman as there is in his British navy, and, as everyone knows, he has condemned this plan of Dreadnoughts being built by the colonies.

BUILT IN CANADA.

It is our intention to have our ships built in Canada if possible. We are prepared to pay a little more for this proposed difference is not extravagant. As soon as the bill passes we can have a plant established in Canada to build these ships. I am not able today to give these details. I shall be better informed when we call the committee to order, but giving the matter the best attention that I can I may say that it would probably take one year to complete a plant to build the ships in this country and then probably eleven years to complete these eleven ships.

NO EMERGENCY.

"The leader of the opposition," continued Sir Wilfrid, "the other day, while approving the principle of this measure, thought that it did not go far enough, but that we should also make an emergency contribution on account of the apprehended danger to Great Britain from Germany. For my part I do not see any cause of danger to Great Britain at this time. Let me say further, that if Great Britain were engaged in a contest, there would be a wave of enthusiasm to assist her sweep over this country and all British countries. It is true Germany is creating a navy, but I see no reason to believe that Germany is creating a navy for the purpose of attack or that England is increasing her navy for purposes of attack.

In 1910 the displacement of the British navy will be 2,000,000 tons, and that of Germany 800,000 tons. Under such circumstances danger is not to be apprehended.

"Why do we ask parliament to vote for this naval service?" continued Sir Wilfrid. "It is simply because this is a necessity for our position and the status we have reached as a nation. Do the gentlemen like Mr. Monk forget the growth of the revenue and the population of Canada? Do they forget that Canada is expanding like a young giant? Are we to be told that under such circumstances that we do not require a naval service? Why, sir, you might just as well tell the people of Montreal, with their population of half a million, that they do not need any police protection? Let the market of Great Britain be lost and it would be lost if British supremacy on the sea were lost, and the prosperity of Quebec would be effected for years if not forever."

MR. BORDEN CRITICISMS.

Mr. Borden quoted from speeches made by Sir Wilfrid as far back as 1891 with the view of showing that the Premier then held different views as to Canada's relations with the Empire from those he expressed now. He charged Sir Wilfrid with having receded from the position he had previously taken when he declared that when the Empire was at war Canada was at war as well. He said that a bill was that the Government had not followed the advice or suggestions of the British Admiralty in 1907 in regard to the matter of control of the naval forces of the empire in time of war, and he quoted the utterances of Lord Tweedmouth and Mr. McKenna in support of the contention that unity of command and of action was essential in time of war. His next point was that section 19 of the bill virtually declared that the Governor in council might refrain from taking any part in war affecting the empire.

Another objection Mr. Borden had to the bill was that it provided for no unity of organization. The men in the navy were to be taken care of by the men, and he believed that it took at least six years to make a sailor efficient on the mighty engines of war on the high seas. Apparently there was no unity of training. Instead of providing a Dreadnought as the main vessel of the fleet, as the Admiralty had recommended, and as Australia and New Zealand had done, the Government was only providing a second class cruiser proposition. Moreover, there was a limitation in the bill as to the immediate disposal of the fleet in event of war.

What would be the use in case of war of the type of cruisers proposed by the government. They might serve its needs, but in actual conflict Australia's and New Zealand's Dreadnoughts would probably have to be called in to protect our petty ships.

It was the duty of Canada to provide such a fleet that with it the Dominion could be able at least to stand side by side with the sister dominions in time of trouble. Mr. Borden criticized as vague the information given by the Premier on the proposal to build the vessels in Canada. Where they would be built in government or private shipyards?

Sir Wilfrid—in private shipyards. Under the present system Mr. Borden thought it would take fifteen years to build up an efficient navy, and the people desire to give immediate and effective aid to the Empire. Meanwhile proposals of a permanent character could be carefully considered before any project was embarked upon.

THE CONSERVATIVE POLICY.

Mr. Borden concluded by moving the following amendment: "That the proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and

FROM CAUSED BY THE COMET Hypothesis Accords With Theories

COMET'S TAIL Illuminated Only by the Cathodic Rays From the Sun

PARIS, Feb. 3.—More than one eminent scientist now holds the ancient idea that the meteorological conditions which determine some of the greatest terrestrial disasters, most notably inundations like that from which Paris is suffering, are in a large degree due to the influence of comets. The opinion of Henri Deslandres, formerly Director of the Astronomical Observatory of Meudon, and member of the Academy of Sciences, is that the tail of a comet is illuminated only by the cathodic rays emanating from the sun. These act upon the infinitely minute phosphorescent particles which compose the mass of the comet's tail, and at the same time, by charging it with positive electricity, push it away from the direction of the sun. When they penetrate the mass of a comet, the cathodic rays are transformed into Roentgen rays. The tail of a comet, therefore, is a tremendous source of these X-rays, whose wonderful power of penetration is well known.

"To explain, then, the action of a comet on the atmosphere, it suffices to know that the X-rays have the property of causing the ionization of vapors. The nucleus of a comet with the earth the more formidable this process of condensation would be. The hypothesis, therefore, may be maintained, although its absolute truth has not been demonstrated."

Provincial News

ST. STEPHEN, Feb. 3.—Fire last evening did slight damage in the east of James McCarty's house on Union street.

Pansy B. and Jack McGregor, two local fast horses, have changed owners in a swap. Alex. Reed becoming the owner of the former and W. H. Kiva of the latter.

The recently elected town council will hold a caucus this evening, and his first public meeting will be held at the Presbyterian congregation. He has increased the salary of his popular pastor, Rev. S. B. Gibson, to \$1200 per annum.

A company of well known and talented people from Eastport, headed by James E. Rosborough is soon to open an up to date restaurant in the Maxwell building on Waterloo street. It will supply a long felt need.

The remains of the late Murray Green who was killed while shunting cars in a railway yard at Westport, Dec. 22, were brought here Tuesday and interred Wednesday afternoon. His widow and daughter accompanied the body and will in future reside here.

Charles E. Huestis, manager of the Maritime Edge Tool Co., was thrown from his team to-day by a sudden start of his horse, and sustained painful injuries. Only last Monday he was thrown from the same team by a collision with a telegraph pole, and was then quite severely injured.

SUSSEX, Feb. 2.—Mr. E. Rogers, who has been employed for some time as bookkeeper by the Sussex Mercantile Co., left for Toronto last night where he will continue his study along business lines with a view of getting the degree of Chartered Accountant.

Mr. Rogers was a former favorite in Sussex and will be much missed by his numerous friends who will wish him every success with his studies, and should he come back to Sussex again he will always find the latch string on the outside.

"Oh for a foot of snow!" is the cry of the lumbermen these days.

The Sussex Manufacturing Co. are unloading cars of dowl wood. Dowl is in great demand, and a great deal of money is being paid by the above mentioned company to owners of wood lots for suitable blocks.

The ice in the Alhambra rink is now in good condition, and all who delight in the fascinating exercise of skating are taking advantage of it.

A general meeting of the Sussex Fire Department will be held to-night instead of Thursday night as heretofore, so as not to interfere with the carnival which will be held to-morrow night.

The Sussex institute is moving right along with the arrangements for the building of a new opera house. Active operations will begin early next summer.

Mr. S. C. McCully, manager of the Sussex Cheese and Butter Co., is confined to his house with illness for the past few days. We trust he will be well again in a few days.

The local Rebecca Lodge had four new members added to its list last night by initiation.

WOODSTOCK, N.B., Feb. 3.—A large and most interesting and enthusiastic meeting was held in the town hall this evening in the interest of the proposed St. John Valley railway. The accommodation was entirely too small. The sledge and doorways were crowded. The representation was not only from the town of Woodstock, but from adjacent and even distant sections of the county. J. T. A. Dible presided. Mr. F. E. Carvell, who was called on by the chairman, said this was the first time he had had the opportunity of a spe-

S Traffic Pas- sarday

country. "To
for, as to the
all the crime
degraded, and
from which it
has wrecked
that ever fell
the worst days
and more groves
and orphans
it has broken
new homes and
has more ruth-
less to which
condemned emi-
we are so fam-
and effects of
do not reflect
reality. It is
use a little
gravity of
The subject is
hands consider-
after the three
Blessed Trinity
there: "A little
od created him,
through the
sly. With his
slaked, nature
second, comes a
is at least ques-
comes a des-
from passion,
and the follow-
ness, madness,
the early stages,
vanishing; yul-
and obscenity,
or soon over-
s gone, a worse
is place. What

At the outset Sir Wilfrid expressed his regret that the continued illness of Hon. Mr. Bredou had deprived the House of some of the keenest of its members, and care which the latter could give to the measure in its discussion before the House.

Continuing, Sir Wilfrid traced in eloquent terms the development of British institutions from centralized autocracy to complete colonial self government. What is the principle, he asked, what is the inspiration, what is the one influence that has made the rebellion in Canada, what has brought Canada to the position that she occupies today?

CONSERVATIVE DISUNION.

Sir Wilfrid, in contrast, referred to the Conservative policy, always divided in council and divided in action. Mr. Foster's resolution last session, he said, was interpreted by the Opposition as an endorsement of the policy of the government.

A CHANGE OF BASE.

When this resolution was moved, said Sir Wilfrid, and accepted by unanimous vote we believed that it would be binding upon the other side of the house. But in this we made a mistake.

NO TRIBUTE.

I need not say that this principle is one to which we on this side of the house cannot agree. We are told that the only way in which naval defense can be carried on is by contribution to the Imperial navy.

THE MAKE-UP OF THE FLEET.

In the composition of the fleet we have not had the good luck to satisfy the opposition. It has been said that we should have accepted the admiralty suggestion and have put our feet unit on the Pacific.

Then we are asked, why did you consent to such an insignificant navy as