

I did not say. I said nothing of the kind, and no human being could have so construed anything I said.

Mr. WRIGHT: I have a little knowledge of the English language, and I will leave it to those hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who read 'Hansard' tomorrow to say whether or not I am right. If hon. gentlemen were to commence to build these two fleet units in Canada, I venture the assertion—and I defy contradiction—that they would send to Great Britain a great deal more than \$35,000,000 for the articles they would have to obtain outside of Canada for the construction of those ships. We are not objecting to the building of ships in Canada, but we do realize that the building of these fleet units as proposed by the Opposition would entail the expenditure of a very large sum of money, and, even if we were to send abroad for only one-half the material required, it would entail an expenditure much larger than \$35,000,000. A statement, based upon reliable information, emanated from this side of the House that we could have built three first-class battleships in England for \$35,000,000. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition immediately jumped at a conclusion, he said: We will meet you; we will spend \$35,000,000 under our proposition, and we will build two fleet units and place one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific. But he has not given one figure to this House to show that this can be done for \$35,000,000, nor has there been produced any estimate to show that it can be done for twice that amount. I say it would cost three times \$35,000,000 before these fleet units were completed.

Mr. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will refer to 'Hansard' he will find that information in that regard has been given many times.

Mr. WRIGHT: I want to refer to another phase of this question. We are told that these fleet units would protect the shipping of Canada. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, if you will, the protection by one fleet unit. Boats leave Vancouver for Honolulu, the Hawaiian Islands, New Zealand, Australia, Tokio, Hong Kong, South American ports, California and Straits of Georgia, San Francisco and Alaska. Are hon. gentlemen opposite serious in regard to that? I venture to say when we consider the fact that boats will continually be leaving for every quarter of the globe, we will come to the conclusion that fleet units on the Atlantic and the Pacific will be of very little use in the protection of our commerce. If we are to have protection of our commerce, we should get it from the British navy. Even if we look at this

matter from the narrow and selfish standpoint of protecting Canadian interests alone, we can do that more effectively through the British navy than by building a little navy of our own.

It is held by some hon. gentlemen opposite that in the event of an enemy approaching Canada we should have vessels to protect our coasts. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) gave voice to this opinion the other day. He said that if we should be attacked on the Pacific by an enemy our fleet unit there would be able to protect us until the arrival of the British fleet. But under their policy Parliament would have to be called together before we could help Great Britain, and hon. members from the various constituencies would have to pronounce upon it, and say whether they were willing that Canada should go to the help of Great Britain. I think I hear the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) asking that all the correspondence between England and the country from which an attack was feared, be laid on the table to consider whether the war would be a just one. Then we would have the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) backing him up, with several hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It would take months before they were really satisfied that we ought to go to the help of Great Britain in an emergency. Suppose, however, that we were attacked, what would be sauce for the goose would be sauce for the gander, and Great Britain would certainly be justified in calling the British Parliament together before deciding whether she would come to the assistance of Canada. Cannot hon. gentlemen opposite see the folly of the whole situation? We must keep the British navy strong enough to protect every part of this great Empire. No foe can successfully attack Canada until she has defeated that navy. That is the fundamental principle of the whole situation, and as a humble representative of this House I feel that we are perfectly justified in expending the amount of money proposed in strengthening the naval defence of this great Empire of ours. It is not particularly for England alone, not for Canada alone, but for Australia, New Zealand, and every other section of the great British Empire.

Under the policy that has been outlined by hon. gentlemen opposite, the greatest amount of publicity would be involved. The question of war would have to be discussed in Parliament and everything would become known. Every enemy of Great Britain would be cognizant of every move that was made. Do hon. gentlemen not realize that under the secret service of Great Britain there are channels through which they learn what is going on in every country in the world, and they are able to move the fleet to Vancouver if necessary, to