

fecting the Public Works Department, and I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not present. Nearly a year ago an order was made by this House for a return, moved for by myself, asking for the number of dredges owned by the government, from whom purchased, the prices paid, and the work that was being done by these dredges. I have spoken to officers in the department on different occasions with reference to this return, and have always received the reply that it was in course of preparation. I know, of course, that the work of preparing a return of that kind is necessarily tedious and perhaps technical, and I felt that ample time was required. I must ask the government now to prepare it speedily, and the reason is that I am informed that the Minister of Public Works has announced it as the policy of the department, if not of the government, to purchase more dredges. I think the return I have asked for should be in the hands of members of the House before a discussion takes place on that particular line of policy, because I think such a return will have a beneficial effect on the minds of the House, and even on the minds of the members of the government, if they contemplate adopting such a policy.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the hon. gentleman's request.

SAULT STE. MARIE DRY DOCK COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government once more with reference to a statement made in the House yesterday with regard to the Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Company. I asked the question as to whether the government had granted to that company the usual subsidy provided for by statute, and the Minister of Public Works said that no decision had then been arrived at. But I saw by a newspaper last evening that the government had decided at a council meeting held either that day or some previous day, to grant a subsidy to that company. I would now ask the hon. the Finance Minister what truth there is in that statement, in view of that statement made by the Minister of Public Works on the afternoon of that day?

Mr. FIELDING. I would prefer to have the question answered by the Minister of Public Works, who, I am sorry, is not present. But it will be my duty to call his attention to what the hon. gentleman has said, and on another occasion to give the information.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the

second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden there to, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, when this matter came before this House during the last session, I took occasion to make a few remarks upon it and to give the opinion which I then held and which, to a great extent, I still hold, upon this great question of imperial defence. I then pointed out that we were doing very much to strengthen and consolidate the empire, and also to provide for its defence, by filling up our western provinces with immigrants from the old country, by building up a powerful and virile people, at the same time relieving the congestion in the old country and finding homes for the people from there. This was a benefit to the old land as well as to ourselves. I then said that by thus building up a strong race in Canada we were establishing what would be a bulwark to the empire, and that in doing that we would render the greatest service we could towards permanently securing the defence of the empire.

I may say further that having recently read some remarks of Lord Roberts, it also seemed to me, although I am not an expert in this matter, that possibly an even better way than the establishment of a navy to strengthen the empire would be to strengthen the military arm of our service. However, the view I then held was evidently not the view of hon. members, and when the discussion came on last March, and we came to unanimous decision on March 29, I supported and voted for that resolution, and having done so I propose to abide loyally by it. I would not have referred to this had it not been that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) made reference to my remarks and rather disconcerted me to this extent, that I was under the impression we were building up a fine race of people in the west, that our prairies were being settled by a virile race that would be a credit to the country, and that we must look to them in the future for our strength. I believed that a great proportion of the people going in there were from the old land and of the Anglo-Saxon race, a people the most desirable to be had anywhere to go into a country and build it up. But if my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) is right, I have been utterly wrong in that supposition, and instead of our western lands being occupied and filled by splendid people of Anglo-Saxon origin, they are being filled with Poles, Doukhobors and others whom the hon. member evidently looks on as undesirable. I regret that those western lands are being filled up in that way. I do not doubt, however, that when the next census is taken my hon.