

pany's business. Further, it seems to me that the agreement that this company was to maintain its original wharf of 225 feet in length at its own expense and give to the Crown all these privileges over it; was an agreement made in the public interest, and I repeat that it absolutely justified the reporter of the 'Globe' in making the statement which he did.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the minister this one question—in that letter from Mr. Osman he says: We will not only allow you to charge for vessels over the old wharf, but the extension which we now propose to make. Does not that imply that the Crown cannot own it? He says: We will allow you the privilege of doing so for both the old wharf and the new; as though it was their own wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the language of the letter, but I will say to him that there is no question whatever, and nobody has ever raised a question outside of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to the ownership of the soil right in the wharf which the Crown has built. That belongs absolutely to the Crown. It is built upon Crown property and it is the sole property of the Crown. Now, just one other word and then I am done. The hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) with that sense of fairness, or rather what he would I suppose assume to be fairness, which characterizes him, suggests that this letter which the manager of the Albert Manufacturing Company wrote to me, with regard to giving these privileges upon the wharf originally built by the company, was probably written by myself. I need not answer that suggestion further than to say that those who know Mr. Osman will know that he is just as capable of putting a fair business proposition in a letter as I would be, and a good deal more able to do it than I would be. I can simply say that I never heard of the letter and never saw the letter until it was submitted to me by my officials in the department here at Ottawa. That is the answer which I make to that, and I think that my hon. friend really had begin to devote his attention to somewhat larger subjects; begin to deal with people a little more fairly, and if he does he will not only do more public good, but he will really do himself very much more good than by pursuing the small tactics which he is pursuing.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), an Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden there—
Mr. PUGSLEY.

to, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory).—resuming—Mr. Speaker, this debate has already continued so long that it seems almost necessary that one should offer some apology for venturing to address the House further. I do not suppose that it is possible for either myself or any of the gentlemen who will follow me, to add much interest or refreshment to the topic now before the House. I do not know but we shall be compelled to take refuge in the excuse of Elihu the son of Barachel, the Buzzite who after having listened for a long and considerable time to the elders speaking; to Eliphaz the Teemanite, Bildad the Shuhite, Zophar the Naamathite and to Job himself, deemed it necessary that he should apologize for speaking and gave his excuse in the words: I will speak that I may be refreshed. Under the circumstances, Sir, those of us who are deeply possessed of sincere opinions on this subject may feel that if we cannot refresh the House we may at all events have some satisfaction in refreshing ourselves when we speak on this matter. I trust that none of us will be open to the accusing inquiry that came in the whirlwind: 'Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge.' I endeavoured yesterday to review somewhat briefly the panics which had possessed the British public in former years. I endeavoured to show that these panics were largely instigated and intensified by the action of elderly men, whose lives had in some cases been spent in warfare, but who had lost somewhat of the nerve and vigour of their earlier years. I mentioned the Duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Ellenborough, and Sir Charles Napier. These are the men who at that time added greatly to the panics which possessed the public mind. I endeavoured to show further that none of these panics were justified by the event. Some of them arose out of the fact that men who for long years had been engaged in military and naval affairs appeared to have lost a correct sense of the perspective regarding the British empire. They seemed to believe that the greatness of the British empire was founded on her army and her navy, forgetting that the greatness of the empire which promises to endure is founded not upon a navy or an army, but upon the principles of freedom and justice, which have inspired the people of that great empire. At the adjournment of the debate, I was endeavouring to show the great progress which had been made in a very few years in the construction of the German navy. I pointed out the great difficulties which met German statesmen; that practically the nation had no harbours; that the people had no savoir faire in sea-