

they can train these same young men in the Imperial navy where there will be ample scope for their abilities to earn promotion.

Under all the circumstances, I think the Government would be well advised to inform the Mother Country that, for the reasons I have already stated, Canada cannot afford to take over the ships which have been offered, and that this Parliament will for the present defer dealing further with the question of naval defence.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of the Naval Service): Mr. Chairman, I am sure all hon. members will at once agree with me that this is the most remarkable speech that has ever been delivered in this House or that ever will be delivered for generations to come. It was rather difficult for me, as I am sure it was for hon. members, to follow the logic of my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), for he set up an argument only to knock it down again. He first argued that we should have nothing in the shape of naval training or naval defence. But he overlooked the statement I made in the House a few days ago that under the Naval Service Act of 1910—which was placed on the Statute Books by my hon. friends opposite—we are in honour bound to maintain the docks at Halifax and at Esquimalt. Under that Act Canada entered into solemn obligations with the Mother Country not only to defend these shores, but to maintain and keep up a navy at all times, under certain conditions and regulations which it is unnecessary for me to specify at the present time. Suffice it to say that we were then obligated and will continue to be obligated, until such time as the Naval Service Act is repealed, to maintain the dockyards at Halifax and at Esquimalt. My hon. friend argued that we should wipe the slate of everything. I presume he intended that we should close up the Naval College at Esquimalt, that college that has such a splendid record. The Canadian cadets turned out by that college have gained a fine reputation for themselves in Canada and in the Imperial Navy that they have served so well during the time they have been in that fine service. But my hon. friend wants the Naval College closed up.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that I wanted it closed up. I did not mention the Naval College. But since the minister has asked me what I would do with the Naval College, I would ask the British Admiralty to take it over.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It goes without saying that if you close up the dockyards at Esquimalt and Halifax, and if you do away with the depot ships we have now, the Niobe and the Rainbow, and if you refuse to accept the generous gift of the British Government, it would certainly be a foolish policy to maintain the Naval College as it exists at the present time. Therefore, I assumed from the remarks of the hon. member that he wanted to abolish the Naval College as well as the dockyards and the depot ships.

He no sooner got through with that part of his argument than he undertook, very feebly and ineffectively, I will say, to prove that this modern cruiser with four-inch and six-inch guns, most modern in every way, these torpedo boat destroyers and the submarines were not modern; that they were of no value. Then, coming back to the Niobe, he went on to say that there was no use of accepting this modern cruiser from Great Britain because the country had the Niobe, and he said: Why not put the Niobe into commission again? I thought the hon. member was quite familiar with the state the Niobe was in at the present time, but apparently he is not; and therefore I will tell him that the Niobe is twenty-five years old and that she has no guns on board whatever.

Mr. DUFF: Whose fault is that?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me, we shall reach all those things later on. It would cost to put the Niobe into commission not less than \$500,000, after she was put into commission, she would cost this country to keep her in commission the very large sum of \$1,445,329. If we agree with my hon. friend and put the Rainbow into commission, at a vast cost to the country also because she is obsolete and without guns and is a ship about thirty years old, it would cost this country \$625,869 to maintain the Rainbow in commission.

My hon. friend having got through with that phase of his argument got more remarkable as he proceeded on his way. He wiped that all out and said that he did not believe in having naval defence of any kind. He returned to the first part of his argument; he said: There is no need of having in this country a cruiser and torpedo boat destroyers. And he got almost panicky over the two modern submarines that the British Government have presented to Canada. One listening to him would think that at once we were going to send these submarines out to sea to shell the various