

had a very small fleet and this great arming of the different nations was not going on, whereas to-day we are right up against an emergency.

The leader of this House says that it will be at least five years. Well, I do not think anyone doubts that it will be at least ten years before the navy which it is proposed by this Bill to provide, will be in practical service. And I do not think there is a man in this House but believes that that will be too late. Suppose that war should come within the next two or three years, what would be the condition of all these colonies? New Zealand would be able to march up to the firing line with her Dreadnought; Australia the same; and I believe, as soon as affairs are settled in South Africa, that part of the empire also will be ready. But where will Canada be? She will not march up to the firing line; she will be standing away off shouting through a megaphone, as I think the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said: 'Don't come near us; we are good runners, but we are no good for fighting.' That will be absolutely the position of Canada, and the Dreadnoughts of New Zealand and Australia will have to defend our little navy, and what will such an inadequate navy cost. Built in England, \$11,000,000. Built in Canada, \$15,000,000. By time ships are finished at least \$20,000,000. Maintenance at least \$5,000,000 per year. Who is to pay for this? Not contractors; not makers of uniform, ammunition and supplies. All these will make rich out of the undertaking. The bulk of the expense will fall upon the farmer and the wage-earner.

There is a most interesting article in last night's Montreal 'Star'. I indicated a little while ago how careful we have to be in what we say about the fourth estate. But the Montreal 'Star', a newspaper of great influence all over this Dominion, probably the paper that goes into the homes of more people in Canada—and I am not advertising the 'Star' now—than any other paper. But I do not think that the 'Star' last night was fair. After thumping everybody on both sides of the House, the 'Star' gave us the assurance that it would announce its policy to-night. I am sure that every man on either side of the House is waiting in great anxiety to learn what this great paper is going to tell us. It will propound a great naval policy; it will tell Canada what to say and do. I sometimes think—cannot help but think—what a great blessing to this country it would be if some of the preachers and some of the editors were only in this House. We should not then have such difficulty in formulating and carrying out great policies. The press is a great institution. We have a tremendous lot to thank them for; they are the disseminators of all that is good. But somehow they sometimes get into the habit of saying pretty hard things. But we have only to wait until to-night, when the Montreal 'Star' comes in, we shall have a proper naval policy for this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I had no idea of taking up so much time. I have only now to sum up and present my conclusions:

1. I believe that the present position of Canada, that of absolute dependence upon Great Britain for our naval protection, is intolerable.

2. I believe that if the people of this country realized that such a condition existed they would vote almost unanimously to terminate that state of affairs.

3. As ninety-five per cent of our exports are water-borne, it is of the utmost importance that our trade routes be protected. Hitherto, Great Britain has policed the trade routes, but the time has come when Canada should relieve the British taxpayer of some of his burden in this respect.

4. We believe that the government's naval policy is miserably inadequate. We believe it to be a foolish, useless, expensive tin pot navy, one that will be of little service in protecting our trade routes or our empire in time of war.

5. I believe, not in a Canadian navy, but in a great imperial navy, the expense of which is borne by the whole British empire, and not by the taxpayers of Great Britain only. I believe that that navy should be under one directing head. I do not see how it could be effective otherwise. If the navy were made which this government proposes, and if it formed a component part of the great imperial navy, then, in time of war, as I have already said, it might be of some use. It may be my fault, but, for my part, I fail to recognize in this Bill anything that will do what I have asked should be done.

6. Experts tell us to-day that the effective vessels are Dreadnoughts. Then, we should demand the immediate construction of one or two Dreadnoughts to be built for Canada, and at the expense of Canada. That will help to stand off the German menace, or the menace of any other country, thereby giving our assistance in maintaining—what I believe to be of world wide importance—the supremacy of Great Britain on the high seas.

7. Sir, I believe that the great majority of the citizens of Canada realize that the future hope of the country, commercially, politically and sentimentally lies in continuing our close relation to the British empire.

I repeat that I stand for one throne, one flag, one navy.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is a circumstance