

urged in creating these panics in Great Britain against Germany. He went further and condemned the journals of the city of London, the leading newspapers of the world, regarded as such in every land, as a yellow press, and he referred in eloquent terms to the removal of the German surtax as an evidence of the friendliness of Germany. We are all, I presume, more or less pleased at the removal of any trade barriers if their removal will benefit this country. But does any one suppose that the removal by this government of the surtax on German goods was not actuated by the action of Germany? When she penalized the Dominion of Canada, Canada, I say, very properly penalized Germany.

Canada, I say, properly penalized Germany; so that this new concession, this surrender on the part of Germany, is not in the interest of the British empire, not in the interest of Canada, but it is in the interest of Germany herself that this surtax has been removed. The hon. gentleman reproved my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with daring to speak of the leader of the government as a master of circumlocution and deceit. There is an old maxim that in a corrupt government there is no such thing as patriotic feeling. Its place is supplied by private interest, public fame and devotion to a chief. We found from first to last that the hon. member, in speaking upon this subject, beslobbered the leader of the government—adulation, devotion to a chief—and his only argument against the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was this: Don't send money to England; keep it in Canada and spend it among the boys. Yet this is the gentleman who reproves my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier for having spoken in terms that did not meet with his approval regarding the first minister, and in the next moment, in referring directly to the motion and, indirectly to the leader of the opposition, he uses the terms, 'audacity' and 'inconsistency.' There is an old Scotch proverb that would aptly fit the hon. member for the Yukon. I need not quote it because he knows it:

Oh, waud some power th' giftie gi'e us
To see oorsels as ithers see us.

I will challenge the pages of 'Hansard' for a number of years past to find more reflections cast upon prominent men in Great Britain than have been cast by the hon. member for Yukon upon the statesmen and soldiers of the old land in his speech of yesterday and to-day. Not content with that the hon. member indulges himself in a little—what shall I say?—I must be careful and not use a harsh term—shall I use the term misrepresentation? His language is as follows:

It does not at all depart from but absolutely carries out the conclusions arrived at by the conference of 1909.

He was speaking of the Bill introduced by the First Minister. What was the proposal of the British government as set forth at the conference of 1909? I shall not go farther back, as it has been entered into in detail before. Section 5 of the report, at page 21, says:

In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

Then it goes on to recite what a fleet unit it is, and in section 11 it speaks of a vessel of the Indomitable type as being necessary. Then, referring to the training, it says:

If the fleet unit maintained by a Dominion is to be treated as integral part of the imperial forces, with a wide range of interchangeability among its component parts with those forces, its general efficiency should be the same, and the facilities for refitting and replenishing His Majesty's ships, whether belonging to a Dominion fleet or to the fleet of the United Kingdom should be the same.

Further, as it is a sine qua non that successful action in time of war depends upon unity of command and direction, the general discipline must be the same throughout the whole imperial service, and without this, it would not be possible to arrange for that mutual co-operation and assistance which would be indispensable in the building up and establishing of a local naval force in close connection with the Royal navy.

In not one solitary point have the wishes of the admiralty, or have the propositions made by the admiralty at the conference of 1909, been carried out by the government in the matter. Our hon. friend enlarged upon the policy of the leader of the opposition in favour of extending \$25,000,000 to Great Britain, and our objecting to the construction of this navy in Canada. Why, Sir, where is the evidence that they are constructing their navy in Canada? Not only are they not constructing a navy in Canada, but they are buying British ships and spending money in weakening the imperial fleet in case of war. If they would build ships it would be all right. We have the guarantee of the right hon. the First Minister that these ships are not going to be of assistance to Great Britain in war unless his sweet will dictates that they shall go. Therefore, with Canada buying these ships as she is to-day, suppose Great Britain were engaged in a war in the course of a few weeks, what would be the position of Canada should the leader of the government not see fit to allow these vessels to go? In the first place, Canadian