

Since landing in this great country some four months back, an expression has often been used in connection with the Canadian navy, not only in conversation with me, but also in the press, which, to say the least of it, is hardly as desirable as it might be. I allude to the term 'Tin Pot.'

I am sorry that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Bennett), is not here to listen to what Commander Roper had to say about himself and the other members of his party who used that term.

Mr. BELAND: He is recuperating.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably. Commander Roper continues:

'Tinpot navy' is often, much too often, used; and I have been to some trouble to find out the origin of the term, and I have come to the conclusion that it is used by some of those people who are in disagreement with the present programme regarding the navy, and I firmly believe that this disagreement arises chiefly through ignorance or want of thought.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is the true Roper.

Mr. MURPHY: I will repeat those words:

Through ignorance-or want of thought. To a large number of people, the beginning and end of a navy is to be reckoned in dreadnoughts, and also as regards obtaining a fleet, all that has to be done is to say: 'We'll have a navy' and they expect to find a fleet of dreadnoughts floating on the St. Lawrence next day. That, of course, is a slight exaggeration, but it is the principle on which they work.

With regard to Canada's share in Imperial defence, a large faction only had one aim in view, namely, the presentation of a couple of dreadnoughts to the Mother Country. There arose other ideas, but whatever they were, a dreadnought was invariably included, and so when these people found that the Government proposal did not include a dreadnought, they immediately designated it 'Tin Pot' which, I think you will agree with me, is rather a contemptuous term to apply to a service which I sincerely trust and hope will, in the near future, be looked upon with gratification and pride by every soul who has the honour of calling himself or herself a Canadian citizen, and who is consequently a member of this great Empire of ours, the greatest the world has ever seen.

To show you how much some of these people understand about what they are talking—a gentleman came up to me the other day and said: 'What I cannot make out is, what Canada wants half a dozen river destroyers for, when the St. Lawrence is the only river they can possibly be required to work on.'

Is it not too bad that the hon. member for Calgary is not in his place to hear the rest of this paragraph?

I then had to explain to him that these river destroyers are ocean-going destroyers of the very latest type, but are technically known as the river class, as they are named after

various rivers in Great Britain to distinguish them from other classes. That, I think, is a very good illustration of the amount of knowledge possessed by some of these people, and I would advise them to go and study Brassey and other standard books, before venturing to talk or write on that which they know so little about.

I would say the same about some of my hon. friends on the opposite side.

Now, a fleet is composed of various classes of ships, namely, battleships, cruisers, torpedo craft, fleet auxiliaries. I have no time to-day to fully explain the working of these classes of vessels in connection with one another. Briefly let me say that battleships are the vessels which should bear the brunt of the fighting, and it is an admiral's duty to so place his battleships that they will in due course meet those of the enemy. Now, he cannot do this without information, and it is the cruisers' duty to obtain and transmit this intelligence. In other words, battleships without cruisers are like blind men without a guide. During my service in the navy, it has been my lot to take part in six of the annual manœuvres while I was serving on the staff of the admiral in command of one side. From beginning to end, it was always one cry 'information.'

The admiral can never be too well informed. Study the life of the greatest of all naval leaders, Nelson, and you will find there that his one cry the whole time was for cruisers. Why? Because he wanted means of obtaining information. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that, at the present moment, Britain has plenty of dreadnoughts. But has she plenty of cruisers? For an expression of opinion I refer you to that distinguished sailor, Admiral Lord Charles Beresford, who emphatically says she has not. When, therefore, the question arises as to what share Canada is to take in Imperial defence, every detail and item must be considered. It is not that Britain requires actual assistance from Canada, so much as she requires that, in the event of trouble, Canada will to a certain extent be able to look after herself. The present naval programme, namely, four cruisers and six destroyers, is framed to meet the existing situation, keeping in view the amount of money available to the Government. These cruisers and destroyers will also be a useful addition to the Imperial navy in the case of necessity. Dreadnoughts cost a lot of money, they also take a large number of men to man them, and docks of the largest capacity to hold them. If, therefore, a policy including dreadnoughts were embarked on, a very large sum of money would be involved, and probably considerably more than Canada can at present afford.

Mr. Speaker, I invite your particular attention to this:

If I were asked as to the relative importance of the various items composing a navy I should place them as follows: Men, ships, docks. Personally I do not believe that we take sufficient count of the personnel. The wear and tear of a future naval war on a human being will be terrific, and in my humble opinion, cases will arise where the per-