

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in Toronto recently, and, although I could not entirely follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I understood him to refer to the visit of his right hon. leader to Toronto. Our friends opposite seem to be surprised and delighted that they have been able to discover that there are still 8,000 Liberals in Toronto and in the province of Ontario. Special trains were run from all directions; delegates were invited from every constituency in the province—and 8,000 men gave acclaim to the right hon. leader of the Opposition. There is no doubt that he deserves it, as he has been a prominent figure in Canadian life for many years. But I am sorry that on this occasion he has not seen fit to overlook party considerations and stand for a policy looking to the benefit of the Empire and the Empire's defence. As far as I could gather from his speech in Toronto, and from the remarks made by hon. gentlemen in this House, the right hon. gentleman has not enunciated a policy which is as big as we believe the right hon. gentleman to be.

The policy of the Government is something more than a course which is intended to be taken for the benefit of the Canadian people; it is for the defence of the Empire. This \$35,000,000 is a very small amount when we consider the vast debt Canada owes to Great Britain for all she has done for us in the past in furnishing absolutely free down to the present time a protection the best that any country in the world enjoys. The remarks made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright), a gentleman who comes from one of the country districts of Ontario, should ring in the ears of hon. gentlemen opposite and bring them to realize that the policy they are preaching is altogether too small for Canada and for the British Empire. This policy, which has been dwelt upon perhaps to no greater extent that its importance deserves, is one that must bear fruit in Canada for many years, and the voting of this amount of money in the clause under discussion is but a feeble expression of what we owe to the Mother Country for the protection we have enjoyed in the past. Although this policy has been bitterly condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite, it can truly be said that their own policy has not been advocated with all the enthusiasm that should have accompanied it. I do not believe that when my hon. friends were in Toronto they went into any great details as to what these two fleet units they desire to build would cost, and I do not find that there is any great enthusiasm on the part of the people of Canada with regard to these two proposed fleet units. Not a

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

single estimate has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to what these two fleet units would cost and of what real benefit they would be. Let hon. gentlemen take warning from Australia, and, if they will, approve the voting of \$440,000,000. What would the people of Canada say if our friends took such a course? The policy they are propounding would not exist only for a day or for a year. If you want to build a plant that will accommodate dreadnoughts, you have to expend £15,000,000, and you cannot go into that expenditure unless you are going to build more ships than are required for these two fleet units. What are you going to do with the shipyards after the ships are built? The shipyard must be permanently employed, and the people of Canada should understand, if they adopt the policy of my hon. friends opposite, that they are not going to spend \$35,000,000, but \$350,000,000 within the next twenty years. We have a much larger territory to defend than Australia and, as applied to Canada, this would be a moderate estimate, and it would be folly to embark on a policy that would call for an expenditure of \$440,000,000, or in round figures, \$20,000,000 per annum. I think our friends would have been fair to the people of Canada if they had put forth their own policy instead of denouncing the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side. If we do not vote this sum of money we shall not do anything for Imperial defence; what do hon. gentlemen opposite propose to do? They say that they propose to build two fleet units, but when they go into the country they simply attack the proposition of the Prime Minister, and neglect to put forward their own policy. I believe that many hon. gentlemen opposite are less pleased with their own policy than we are led to believe; I believe that at the bottom of their hearts many of these gentlemen are opposed to embarking upon any naval expenditure whatever, but they keep their ideas on the subject carefully submerged, and attack the policy of voting \$35,000,000 to cover the next two or three years and the devising of a permanent policy in the meantime. This question is too big to be treated in the way it has been treated by hon. gentlemen opposite.

The hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) spoke of the iron and steel industries. I am in favour of encouraging all classes of industries, shipbuilding included, but I know the limitations of Canada, and at the present time it would be the height of folly for Canada to embark upon any policy such as that proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for South Cape Breton lamented the fact that we were allowing