

tle men opposite have spoken of it have received their answer from the hon. gentleman. I must attribute to my hon. friend a good deal of courage. I can see by his speech and by his training that he is a fighting man and he has had a good deal of courage to charge the fighting man of the government, the Minister of Militia, with cowardice. I think that the Minister of Militia has said that the Munroe doctrine was of great interest to us, that it was a great protection to us and the hon. gentleman (Mr. H. H. McLean) says it is cowardice to say that. He has a fighting quality about him. He criticised the statement made that it will cost more to build a navy in Canada. To whom can we attribute that statement? His leader was the first man who mentioned that in the House, and he said it would cost 30 per cent or one-third more to build a navy in Canada than in England. I think he is a good honest critic of the other side of the House.

I do not think long speeches will build a navy, I am rather inclined to think they will delay it, but some things have been said in this House with which I do not agree. A good deal has been said about launching the country into militarism. A navy is just the opposite of militarism, and if you wish to go back in history, you will see that the battle of Trafalgar hindered the greatest military organization that this world has ever seen. What did Pitt say? That England had saved herself by her exertions and she intended to save Europe by her example.

They say that we want to build this navy in Canada. That is a laudable object, but perhaps it is the lowest possible ground on which you could put this question today. If there is a crisis then the most effective way of meeting that crisis is our duty, wherever it may be. I shall not endeavour to prove whether there is a crisis or not, but the prominent public men of England, of both political parties, men not apt to lose their heads in a crisis, have indicated to the world that there is a crisis. Then the duty of Canada is to assist in thwarting the purpose of whoever intends to bring to England that crisis. Does any one pretend to say that the proposal of the government will in any sense meet that crisis? Does any one pretend that a navy or dock-yard started this year in Canada for the purpose of building war vessels in the next five or ten years will meet that crisis? Does any one pretend to say that if we had our navy ready tomorrow and fully equipped it would in any sense assist to meet the crisis? If there was trouble between Germany and England—and God forbid there ever shall be any such trouble—a great naval battle would take place and that battle would not

Mr. BRODER.

last more than fifteen or twenty days at the most, then where is your Canadian navy to assist England? The result would be that England's ports would be blockaded. If Germany became victorious, England's ports would be blockaded, and the Canadian navy would be as helpless as an infant in the cradle to help England in the crisis. The bounden duty of Canada is to rise in her loyalty to the empire and to British connection and to do her the most effective service if there is a crisis as we are told there is.

We have heard a good deal from the opposition side of the House from the right hon. leader down to the smallest singer of the song, and what has it been? The 20th century for Canada! Look at our great resources, look at our great revenue. The 20th century is Canada's. They would thus lead England to great expectations and hopes in reference to Canada's assistance to the empire and when they come to offer their gift, what is it? In the first instance it is a flat refusal. Who makes that refusal? The right hon. gentleman who leads the government of this country. He said in this House a few days ago, as an answer to the proposition from the leader of the opposition, that the matter should be submitted to the people, he said it had been before the country. How has it been before the country? In 1907 the right hon. gentleman in the conference absolutely refused to do what he is proposing to do to-day. I am not asking him to take my statement, I shall read what the right hon. gentleman did say in the conference in answer to a resolution moved by a gentleman from South Africa. I shall read the resolution and shall show that the Premier of Canada flatly refused to vote for it, and out of respect to his refusal that resolution was withdrawn. Then he went to the country in 1908, making this refusal and the country endorsed him; hence, they must have endorsed his refusal. Then, it is necessary that we should go to the country with his present proposition. Let us see what he says: Dr. Smartt, a colleague of Dr. Jameson, moving the following resolution:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.