

great granary of the world, a few gentlemen here raised the question of a Canadian contribution to the imperial navy, I joined issue with them and was sustained by the press and public opinion.

Thus he joins issue with the proposition which my hon. friend is now making, and the old man says that he was sustained by the press and public opinion, that my hon. friend was wrong and that he was right.

The demand will soon be made by some that Canada should contribute to the imperial navy in proportion to population, I regard as preposterous and dangerous. I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons which pledged parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of the Canadian navy and to support England in every emergency. . . . I cannot understand the demand for Dreadnoughts in the face of the fact that the admiralty and the British government have determined that it was not the best mode of maintaining the security of the empire, and arranged with Canada and Australia (the latter of whom had offered one or two Dreadnoughts) for the construction of local navies to keep open the trade routes in case of war.

But with an interest in the Conservative party, whose leader he had been and which, in his time, he had adorned with his splendid abilities, he gives it this warning:

I cannot avoid thinking that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question.

Yet, the hon. leader of the opposition, flouts his predecessor. He cares not for the experience of this man of Dominion fame, yes of imperial fame, and who comes from the same province as the hon. leader of the opposition and myself. My hon. friend knows that Sir Charles Tupper, during all his long life, has taken the position which he reiterated in that letter and which has been his attitude all along. If we were to believe my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the sentiments expressed by Sir Charles Tupper were the sentiments shared by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier. Yet, my hon. friend, under the pressure of the composing room, the rack and the thumb screw, about which the hon. member for North Toronto knows so much, climbs down, and turns right away from its policy and the position which he has taken from the very time when responsibility began. Now, this is part of the case. I do not want to exhaust all the material. My hon. friends who will speak upon this subject can summon witnesses, numerous and influential, and I think also witnesses of character whose judgment will carry weight. My hon. friends joined in the resolution. They told

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

the delegates that went over to England last year that they must take the position that Canada must build her own navy; and secondly, above everything, do not give them a contribution. That has been reiterated everywhere—do not give them a contribution, but let us work out a plan in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and let us build a Canadian navy that will stand for Canada in time of peace and stand by Canada and the empire in time of war. That was the policy which they asked for, that is the policy which has been developed, and that is the policy which the premier of this country asks the people and the members of this House to ratify here to-day. Now, some of our hon. friends say: Oh, this is a tinpot navy, and that kind of thing is something that Canada does not want. She wants Dreadnoughts. They talk about Lord Charles Beresford. Every one knows how certain gentlemen in Canada tried to dragoon Lord Charles Beresford into making some statement last fall in support of this innocent policy of theirs, but they could not succeed. He would not do it. What is the history of Lord Charles Beresford? For the last five years he has been contending against Sir John Fisher on this very question of Dreadnoughts as against cruisers, and holding that smaller vessels necessary for coast defence and to protect commerce were more important than were large vessels of war. Let me read an extract from the Portsmouth 'Evening News,' where Lord Charles Beresford recently ran an election:

The 'News' learns from a trustworthy source that provision will be made in the navy estimates for four battleships, two armoured cruisers, eight small cruisers, twenty-four destroyers, and ten submarines. The shipbuilding programme will be a further admission of the accuracy of Lord Charles Beresford's contention that more small cruisers and destroyers are needed.

The policy of Lord Charles Beresford has been and is to-day—and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot conceal the fact—in favour of the theory that the trade routes of this country and the trade routes of the empire should be protected by the smaller cruisers, and that has been the cause of the bitter quarrel between him and Sir John Fisher. I could quote also the opinion of Sir Wm. White, but that has been referred to by the Minister of Militia. Now, I want to call attention to a statement of the various schemes for the commonwealth of Australian naval defence from 1902 to the present time, and this statement which I have before me shows that not until 1909, when the proposition of building an armoured cruiser—not a Dreadnought, mind you, the people of Australia are not giving a Dreadnought, they are putting an ar-