

opinion the next war will take place in the Pacific. Another reason why I am dealing with the Pacific more particularly is because it is remote from Great Britain. A fleet can cross the Atlantic from Britain to Halifax, in, I suppose, four days; but it would take that fleet two or three weeks, possibly six weeks, to reach the Pacific.

To give you some idea of the great importance of the Pacific I may mention that the tonnage sailing in and out of Pacific ports has increased from 500,000 tons to 11,000,000 tons. Even the tonnage going in and out of the port of Vancouver last year amounted to 2,000,000 tons.

Now, I come to my main argument and it is this. We assert that we need defence on the Pacific coast, and if it should be asked "defence of what?" I would point to the dry dock in Victoria, and the large expenditures on public wharves and public buildings. In Vancouver we have a floating dry dock of very considerable value, we have the elevators and all the government plant connected with Vancouver harbour. Millions are invested there and further investments will likely be made. We have the terminals also of three railway lines. The same conditions prevail more or less in Prince Rupert. They have an elevator building there, and they have also the terminal of a transcontinental line. Roughly speaking, and keeping within a conservative estimate, it is estimated that the value of these public works and including private property would be something like \$200,000,000. Now on a war insurance basis the premiums on this tremendous amount would come to a very large sum indeed. There is in addition a coast line entirely open and utterly defenceless of something like ten thousand miles, with numerous inlets, also the great Fraser river opening into the centre of the country, which it is desirable to have protected.

But the most important thing of all, and on which I would base my sole argument as to the need of the defence, if there were no other ground for it, is the shipping interests out there. The exports and imports into Canada by sea, leaving out the exports by land to or from the States, amount to \$2,000,000 every day of the year, that is, there are two million dollars worth of merchandise going out from or into Canadian ports every day. The average voyage would take perhaps fourteen days. That would represent something like fifty million dollars worth of goods constantly on the ocean going to or from Canadian ports. That gives hon. members an idea of the magnitude of the shipping interests. Those interests of course would be the main object

of attack. An enemy gunboat might come and put the city of Victoria or Vancouver to ransom, or they might come and blow up the dry dock, but the greatest damage they could do to Canada would be the attacking and destroying of the shipping. It was different with the Germans who had to be content with sinking ships, because they could not get them into their own harbours. In our case the enemy out there would have the double advantage, because not only would we lose the goods and ships but she would have the benefit of both ships and the goods themselves, which would be seized by her. This would not be done by men-of-war, slow-going vessels, but it would be accomplished by light cruisers, or even by armed raiders. They might blow up a town or two and hold them to ransom but the main object would be to blockade the country and destroy the shipping. The greatest damage would be to the province of British Columbia, because that is where the different trade routes converge coming into port. Once a ship got out in the open Pacific it would have a chance for its life, because the ocean is very big and the British fleet would be likely to safeguard the main routes, but when it comes to the smaller ports the greatest danger would arise. That is what we have to defend on the Pacific

It may be asked, against whom do you suggest it would be necessary to defend? We have all observed the complications that are arising in Europe. You have only to read the daily paper to see how constantly near a conflagration they are. Dealing with the situation on the Pacific ocean, there are seven nations involved, or counting Australia, New Zealand and Canada as one, there are five nations with large territorial interests and coast lines, and any one of them may precipitate a war at any time, or one of the nations may, as in the case of Belgium, be dragged into a war quite unwillingly.

Now consider the possibilities of war. I know it is very unpopular to talk about war. There is a sort of psychological reaction against it. The sufferings the public have endured, during and since the war, have given them a distaste for the subject, and they want to try and put it out of their minds by refusing to talk about it, and they say, "There is no war and there will be no war". But we would be lacking in our duty as legislators, if we shut our eyes to the plain facts, however willing we may be to do so. We are told that there is no need to talk about war, we have the League of Nations. Yes, we have the League of Nations. I could talk for an hour on the disabilities connected with the League of Nations, but I think it