

countries, the annual borrowings from the British Isles are as follows:

Chili..	\$ 20,696,000
Japan..	33,361,000
Russia..	47,703,000
Mexico..	64,371,000
United States..	68,000,000
Brazil..	73,000,000
The Argentine..	117,000,000
Canada (nearly)..	200,000,000

Receiving that tremendous amount of money every year from Great Britain surely we should be willing to do something in support of her navy. They say that in the hour of need they would be willing to spend their last dollar, but where would they get their last dollar, all these dollars I have been talking about? Further than that, what would our farmers do? We export to Great Britain about \$135,000,000 worth of our products every year. What will we do in the hour of danger if we cannot get the money? I cannot understand the argument of our friends opposite that if the hour of need comes then they will do something. What can we do in the hour of need? If there is any one thing that any one country cannot buy, no matter how rich it is, it is naval strength.

It takes three years in Germany and five years in Great Britain to train soldiers; and if we should have a war with Germany, would it last three years or three months? How long do naval wars last in these days? And, unfortunately, we cannot buy Dreadnoughts at the corner store. It takes considerable time to construct these ships, which experts say are the only kind that are of any service to-day in naval wars. These patriots talk about duty and about what they will do when the hour of need comes; but they actually refuse to allow us to make preparations so as to be in a position to do our duty when the hour of need does come. They cry peace, peace, when there is no peace. There is no assurance for peace equal to a strong navy. What has done more for universal peace throughout this world than the supremacy of the British navy? No man will dispute the fact that in the past the paramount influence of the British navy has been the great factor in maintaining the peace of the world. But that influence must remain efficient and sufficient, so that England and Canada and all the other colonies together will be able to hold their own against all-comers. I picked up to-day the sayings of some men whose opinions are very much respected—not ancient men, but modern men. Mr. Roosevelt says that 'a first-class fighting navy is the most effective guarantee for peace the United States can have'; and what is true of the United States is true of every other country in the world. President Taft has just expressed the same

opinion. Lord Roberts says that 'an effective army is an essential condition of peace and security'. The present German chancellor says that 'the moment Germany decides to reduce her equipment peace would be seriously threatened'. Mr. Deakin, the ex-premier of Australia says that 'they who prepare for war in point of fact do so only to preserve peace'. It is Alfred Austin, the poet laureate, who sings to us from across the seas:

Nor you nor we would others wrong,
We only claim to hold our own;
For this we arm, for this keep strong,
Safeguard justice on her throne.

No logical mind can deny the truth of the argument that strength discourages war and helplessness invites attack. The question of the safety of the empire in my opinion must be put beyond any possible doubt. As an empire we do not aim at any aggressive action or any increase of territory. We do not threaten any other country. We want to keep clear of all international disputes. But nevertheless we do wish to consolidate this great empire for the purpose of mutual defence. Hitherto the British navy has solely maintained that supremacy. In my opinion it is high time we were doing something to share that burden. We should be standing shoulder to shoulder as Britains. Union is strength, and closer union means greater strength. No other nation is so dependent upon waterborne food and raw material for its existence. We must keep our trade routes free from attack from other nations. Is there any doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman that an attack on our trade routes would paralyse the trade of Canada as well as Great Britain? To give this House and this country some idea of the enormous trade of the empire, let me give the relative proportions of the shipping interests, taking the latest figures of tonnage that I can get here:

	Sailing vessels. Tons.	Steam vessels. Tons.
United Kingdom..	1,461,376	10,023,726
Australia..	126,579	249,832
Natal..	856	811
New Zealand..	43,967	88,629
Canada (including inland navigation)..	411,885	287,867
Newfoundland..	129,876	12,352

All this tonnage has been hitherto protected by the British navy alone. Now, let us look at the figures of the trade of the British empire. The imports and exports, 1907 and 1908, were as follows:

	Imports.	Exports.
United Kingdom..	£649,612,926	£520,138,135
Australia..	51,896,809	72,888,003
South Africa..	57,979,502	98,984,848
New Zealand..	17,302,861	20,068,957
Canada..	\$309,756,608	\$361,572,159
Newfoundland..	2,143,130	2,487,461