

By many leading Canadians whose opinions are entitled to respect, it would be preferred to follow the course recently adopted by New Zealand, and to make a money 'grant-in-aid' of British navy estimates, leaving the decision as to the use made of the money to the Admiralty, who would be free to construct what numbers and types of ships they thought proper, to arrange for manning them, and to employ them in whatever service they chose as units of the Royal navy. This would be a simple plan, no doubt, would involve a minimum expenditure on construction, armament, manning and maintenance, and would secure early completion of these additions to the fleet. On the other hand the plan favoured by the Canadian government and (as I believe) supported by a preponderating opinion amongst the people of the Dominion is natural in the circumstances, has some distinct advantages, and tends to cultivate a national interest in the fleet, while it gives opportunities for the personal service of Canadian citizens in the naval defence of the empire. The government of the Australian Commonwealth is acting on lines similar to those favoured by the Canadian government, and has decided on the creation of its own navy before the Imperial Defence Conference of this year was arranged. In doing so Australia abandoned the plan of an annual cash payment (or subsidy) to British navy estimates, which had been in force since 1888.

I say that a Canadian built navy would be much more acceptable to the Canadian people than cash contributions to the British exchequer. The Canadian national sentiment would be much feebler if Canadian money was invisibly spent in England, instead of having a navy of our own, of having the ships under our own eyes, manned by our own people and built in our own yards. At first the navy would not be built as well as it would be in England, granted. The cost may be greater, granted again. But we must begin. I believe we will become a great nation, and we must arouse the pride of the Canadian people. If we were to argue, as some of my hon. friends argue on the other side of the House, we might bring back to this country the British garrisons. The British garrisons have departed, and we have assumed the care of Esquimalt and Halifax. We have now our own militia. Is it not better to form our own seamen instead of hiring, not Hessians, as in the days of old, but our sailors from the mother country, who, otherwise, would be of service to the motherland in the North sea and the British channel? Is it not better that we should have Canadian sailors on both the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans? Shipbuilding should not be confined to England, it should be extended to Canada. That was the view taken by Lord Milner when he came to this country a few months ago. That is the view of the grand old Canadian statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, in a letter he addressed to the Canadian press a few months ago, wherein he ex-

Mr. LEMIEUX.

pressed his hope that the leader of the opposition would remain faithful to the policy unanimously adopted in this House on the 29th of March, 1909. Let me also quote the words of a Conservative paper, a patriotic paper, I mean the Ottawa 'Evening Journal':

Canadian navy built in Canada means the spending of the money in Canada, the establishment of shipyards and naval training schools in Canada, the building of ships in Canada, the employment of men in Canada, the purchase of material here, the encouragement of other Canadian industries. It means a stimulus to Canadian towns and cities, a new development of national self education and confidence, the avoidance of possible causes of friction with the mother country. The contribution policy means that Canadian taxes are spent in England, and they may become a source of friction and irritation, a source of dissatisfaction, here and there, as to the amount, and the way it should be expended. There will be no continuity to the system.

These are all strong reasons for adopting the policy propounded this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman. We are reminded by some that ours is only a tin pot navy, whilst in the province of Quebec it is regarded as a luxury. Sir, I thought my hon. friends had more pride. I have here a list of independent countries, and self-governing colonies, whose population does not exceed 10,000,000 people, and is in many cases less than that, who have navies of their own:

NAVIES OF COUNTRIES HAVING LESS THAN 10 MILLION INHABITANTS.

Argentina.—9 cruisers and armoured cruisers, gunboats and torpedo boats. Population, 7,000,000, 6,000 men. Naval policy, \$35,000,000. 3 Dreadnoughts under contract.

Brazil.—15 armoured cruisers, 5 dockyards. Chile.—7 armoured cruisers, 3 Dreadnoughts under contract. Population, 3,750,000.

Columbia.—3 cruisers on the Atlantic; torpedo boats; 2 cruisers on the Pacific. Population, 2,500,000.

Costa Rica.—1 torpedo boat, 1 gunboat. Population, 350,000.

Denmark.—9 armoured cruisers and monitors. Population, 2,500,000.

Equator.—1 torpedo boat, 1 transport, 250 men. Population, 1,250,000.

Greece.—3 armoured cruisers and 20 torpedo boats; 4,000 men. Population, 2,000,000

Haiti.—6 warships, 3rd class cruisers, gunboats. Population, 1,500,000.

Mexico.—10 gunboats, 1 training ship, 6 protected cruisers, 198 officers, 965 men. Population, 13,000,000.

Holland.—17 cruisers, 8,000 men. Population, 5,750,000.

Norway.—5 cruisers, 1,000 men. Population, 2,500,000.

Paraguay.—5 transports and coast defence ships. Population, 700,000.

Peru.—5 armoured cruisers, 2 cruisers. Population, 5,000,000.

Portugal.—8 armoured cruisers, 5,687 men; Population, 5,500,000.