

will utilize their war fleet where it will reach the most vulnerable point and best protect and safeguard our interests. For this reason, I shall oppose the Bill and support the resolution in amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, with the firm belief that in doing so, I am voicing the consensus of opinion in my own constituency at least.

Mr. SEALEY. In view of the resolution unanimously passed by this House on the 29th March last, and in view of the newspaper discussion throughout Canada since then, as well as the discussions by public men in the meantime, it would seem to me that the time has arrived when Canada should make a beginning in the establishment of a Canadian navy. We have heard a good deal about our duty to the empire and loyalty to the King, but, personally, I have every confidence in the thorough loyalty of every Canadian to the empire and the King, to the last dollar and the last man. The only difference of opinion seems to be as to how we can best put that loyalty into actual and useful practice. For that purpose, we have three propositions before us. We have the Bill of the government proposing the construction of the Canadian navy, out of Canadian material, by Canadian workmen, in Canada and owned entirely by Canada. Then we have the amendment of the leader of the opposition, proposing a contribution of either two Dreadnoughts or \$25,000,000, and a plebiscite to decide whether we should do anything further or not, and we have the further amendment proposing that we should do nothing. As between the three I favour the first—a Canadian navy, built in Canada out of Canadian material by Canadian workmen.

As the trend of the discussion generally has largely had to do with the attitude of Germany, so without repetition I might occupy the time of the House a few minutes in saying something about Canada and on behalf of Canada's interests in what we propose doing. The construction of a navy in Canada would do many things for this country. It would not only be in the best interests of Canada but of the empire as well, whereas a contribution of money would merely mean the expenditure of it by Britain and the incurring of that much additional debt by this country, because I do not suppose we have \$25,000,000 surplus not in use to contribute. We would not be giving any immediate benefit to the British navy, because to-day the British navy yards have orders for future delivery more than they can fulfil, and are taxed to their utmost. Consequently to increase the British navy faster than it is being increased, we must have additional shipyards, and personally I would prefer to have those additional shipyards in Canada. A few days ago we

learnt by the daily newspapers as well as quotations in this House that, to the credit of Australia, her first born had been launched in England and christened the 'Paramatta' by Mrs. Asquith. Personally, I would prefer seeing Canada's first born launched in Canada and christened the 'St. Lawrence' by Lady Laurier. I believe that by the construction of a navy in Canada we would not only be doing our duty by the empire, but by Canada as well, and we would add to Canada's prosperity along commercial lines as well as naval and military lines. This Bill provides for the construction of a Canadian navy, composed of four ships of the Bristol type, one Boadicea and six destroyers, the construction to be completed within the next four years at an expenditure of \$12,000,000, or an average of \$3,000,000 per year. The first \$3,000,000 would of necessity require to be expended in the construction of dry docks and shipyards, and I believe that, apart from the question of the navy, it would be worth \$3,000,000 to have those dry docks and shipyards constructed in Canada. A few months ago, when the Empress of Ireland became disabled and a notice came by wireless telegraphy, her owners arranged to send her around to New York to be repaired, because we had no accommodation in Canada for vessels of that size. In my opinion our trade and commerce and our merchant marine are too important to remain longer in that condition, so that I believe that, irrespective of the navy, we should do something to secure in Canada facilities for the construction and repairs of our merchant marine, so that this first year's experience would be of the greatest possible benefit to Canadian commerce. If at the end of the first year, we have these dry docks and shipyards constructed, we shall have good results for Canadian trade and commerce apart altogether from the standpoint of a Canadian navy.

The second year we would require to go largely into the equipment of our navy yards with drills, punches, trip hammers and all that sort of thing. Our iron and steel companies would require to instal in their plants rolls, not for turning out steel rails, but for turning out ship plates, and every machine shop and factory in general would require to prepare for turning out the various requirements of a navy yard, because as I understand it, the intention is not merely that the parts be built in Britain and assembled in Canada, but that they be constructed in Canada as well as put together there. What a stimulus that would be to the various industries, machine shops and other concerns providing the necessaries for the equipment of our navy yards. That alone would be worth another \$3,000,000 to Canada. And I believe that at the end of the second year, even though we had not a battleship constructed, we