

moured cruiser at the head of their fleet—not until 1909 was there a single proposition in Australia to build a vessel larger than 3,000 tons. But, in the Canadian naval programme we have one vessel of 4,300 tons, one vessel larger, and destroyers of the improved river type, which are all along the line of the sound and wise judgment of the men both inside and outside the admiralty whose opinion is worth having on this matter. That is our policy, Mr. Speaker, and I do not need to amplify it at greater length.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the hon. gentleman; does he say that the Australian fleet unit does not include any vessel larger than 3,000 tons?

Mr. MACDONALD. With the exception of the one vessel included in the Australian programme of this year. In all the naval programme of Australia, from 1902 down to that date, not a single one of these programmes included a vessel over that tonnage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the programme of 1909.

Mr. MACDONALD. The armoured cruiser of this year exceeds that tonnage, but in the various other programmes not one of the vessels exceeded 3,000 tons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That armoured cruiser is of the Dreadnought type?

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know about that. The Hon. Mr. Fisher, of Australia, who ought to know took issue on that question, and he declared it was not of the Dreadnought type, and his judgment ought to be worth more than that of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not know what took place in Australia; I am referring to the paper which has been brought down to us and laid on the table of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Fisher, of Australia, took the position that the programme has been changed and that instead of a Dreadnought it was an armoured cruiser.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know anything about any change having taken place in Australia, and my hon. friend may be right about that, but the paper laid on the table of the House certainly does refer to an armoured cruiser of that type.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am speaking of the programme laid before the Australian parliament by the Hon. Mr. Fisher in October last, and he starts out with one armoured cruiser of the Indomitable class.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the exact date in October?

Mr. MACDONALD. I have not got the date at hand, but I will endeavour to get it for my hon. friend. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured, probably at too great length, to outline what our policy is, and why we have adopted that policy. I believe, Sir, that all parties in this country will agree that our policy is a wise one. As I have shown, that policy has the approbation of the admiralty. I believe that Canada is acting wisely in to-day laying the foundation of a greater navy, making the beginning of a navy which will grow with our growth and expand with our development. I believe, Sir, that is the wise and sensible course for Canada to take, and I am confident it will be vindicated by the people of this country.

But, let us see where our friends opposite are on this question. We have no less than three or four policies from the opposition. The leader of the opposition starts out by saying: No Canadian navy; in the dire necessity of Great Britain, at the present time we will give her \$25,000,000 to do what she pleases with it. It is not to build Dreadnoughts mind you, because the word Dreadnought was introduced into that resolution simply and solely for the purpose of misleading the people, and helping out the men who wanted to take the stump in the back concession lines, to talk about Dreadnoughts. It was a good sounding phrase! And so they put it in the amendment. What the hon. leader of the opposition says is: Give England \$25,000,000 because there is a tremendous naval necessity at the present day, give them a cash contribution and dont bother about a Canadian navy. And, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says: Wipe out this Canadian navy business, we dont want it. I dont care whether there is necessity or not, I dont care whether the weary Titan is groaning under the burden or not, give them \$25,000,000, I dont care where you are going to get it, I dont care whether you have to borrow the money or not, find it somewhere and send it over. Then my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has another policy, and I am sorry he is not in his seat now because there are one or two things I would like to say to him. His policy is to do nothing at all; his policy is a policy of attempting to set in flame the embers of discord in this country. Imagine the hon. member from Jacques Cartier undertaking to appeal to the spirit of the men of 1837. A lot he knows about the men of '37. Why, he belongs to a class who spoke of the men who fought at that date for responsible government as the smooth faced, insidious instigators of the doctrine of rebellion. That is the school from which my hon.