MR. CARVELL SHATTERS THE "OBSOLESCENT" TALK OF MINISTER OF MARINE

Proves With Striking Figures Used by the Greatest Naval Experts in the World That There is Very Little Difference Between the Bristol Type and the Last Word of the Admiralty in Cruiser Construction—Mr. Hazen's Poor Excuse.

Speaking in the house of commons last week F. B. Carvell, the aggressive member for Carleton county, gave Mr. Hazen an unhappy hour, as he dealt with the minister of marine's stock reference to the "Roper memorandum" as his excuse for refusing to execute the Cammel Laird contract and thereby bring a great industry to St. John.

Mr. Carvell also shattered Mr. Hazen's feeble attempt to argue that the ships if constructed in Canada, would be obsolescent before finished. Hansard quotes him as follows:

We had a little attempt at explanation of the policy of the government on the part of the minister of marine last evening, after a quiescent interval of something like a month. It is most remarkable that he could throw no further light upon the subject than he did. The government seems to be perfectly willing to sit quiet in their seats and take no part in the debate and give us no further information. Things have happened in the last month and in the last three months and enough things have happened in the last six months to cause a government which really wanted to work for the best interests of the country to call a halt in this whole thing. As I understand, the minister of marine has put up the only argument which the government intends to or can put up in answer to the criticisms of this proposition made by members on this side of the house. The whole gist of his argument was that because the Fore River Shipbuilding Company at Quincy (Mass.) had made a financial failure, it was impossible to build ships in Canada. There cannot be any other reason for his alluding to that company. If any hon. gentleman can show any other possible application I would be glad to make way for him.

Mr. Foster (Kings, N. S.): It seems to me that it was clear to every hon. gentleman in this house that the reason the minister referred to the Fore River Shipbuilding Company was to prove that the member for St. John did not know what he was talking about in that particular instance.

Mr. Carvell: My friend from Cape Breton says there are others like him. I have never yet used the tu quoque argument in this house and do not wish to commence it today. My hon. friend from Kings ought to be allowed, in all justice to himself, to make a speech on this subject. The prime minister might remove the gag from the lips of a few of his younger followers and let them show their constituents some reason for their existence here. I find no fault with my hon. friends from Kings for attempting to get in a little bit of information o nthis matter. But I am afraid that so far as the real subject at issue is concerned, he has not given very much light.

The minister of marine last evening gave a lot of figures in the effort to show that it would cost £9,500,000 to get ready to build a ship in Canada. He said: You will have to spend £1,000,000 or $5,000,000 in a shipyard, $5,000,000 in rolling mills, $10,000,000 in armor plate plant, $5,000,000 in engineering works, $17,500,000 in gun works, $2,000,000 in proving ground, and $3,000,000 in torpedo and ammunition works. I would like to ask if any hon. gentleman in this house can name a solitary shipyard on earth that produces all the articles manufactured in the different plants mentioned in the speech of the hon. minister last evening. I have not the absolute knowledge and therefore I cannot make the absolute statement but I do not believe that there is a plant on earth which produces one-half the articles that make up a complete ship.

I have been through the largest shipbuilding plants in Great Britain and in my judgment perhaps the most complete there would be that of Armstrong, Whitworth & Company, of Newcastle-on-Tyne or Elswick. They build the hull, the guns and the turret, but they do not build the armor plate, the boilers, the engines or the electrical work. There are a thousand things about it that they do not build.

Mr. Meighen: The Vickers-Maxim Company do.

Mr. Carvell: They do not, they build the ships, guns and turrets.

Mr. Meighen: Oh, yes, they do.

Mr. Carvell: Even then there are a hundred other things that they do not build. The minister of marine tries to use the unfair, dishonest argument made by Mr. Churchill in his letter—and I again use that word advisedly—to prove that we cannot build ships in Canada because it is necessary to have all these different collateral establishments to build all the materials that enter into the construction and equipment of a battleship. Of course, it is necessary to have guns to go into a ship, but I think I am safe in saying that there is not a shipbuilding establishment in the United States that manufactures its own guns. In fact, there are only two shipbuilding plants in the British Empire that manufacture their own guns: the Armstrong, Whitworth Company at Newcastle, and Vickers Sons & Maxim. They do manufacture their own guns, but all the other shipbuilding firms buy their guns from whatever concern happens to have them in the market.

In the United States the Fore River Shipbuilding Company bought its guns from the Bethlehem Steel Company. I only mention these things to show what an unfair argument the hon. minister of marine and fisheries attempted to make last evening. He even went so far as to say that if we wanted to build a ship in Canada, we would need engine works costing $5,000,000. I do not believe there is a shipbuilding firm in the world that builds its own engines and boilers

When my hon. friends from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) was speaking I was looking up something about the United States navy, and I found in Burgoyne's Annual a statement that throws some light on how those vessels are built, or rather how they get the different pieces of machinery. If you turn to Burgoyne's Annual, page 163, you will find a description of the ships of the Delaware class which are the very latest pattern built in the United States. Referring to the Florida and the Utah it states that they were built in different yards entirely. The Florida was built in the navy yard at Brooklyn. I am not sure where the Utah was built, but it was at a different place.

These shipbuilding yards did not make their own boilers; they bought Babcock and Wilcok's boilers, which are well known throughout the civilized world. They buy the boilers and the engines from the highest class works. Then again on page 189 reference is made to three destroyers built by the United States government withi nthe last two or three years. The Jarvis, the Jovett and the Henley, practically the latest type of destroyers. The Jarvis was built by the New York Shipbuilding Company at Camden (N. J.); the Henley by the Fore River Shipbuilding Company at Quincy (Mass.), and the Jovett at Bath (Me.); all different shipyards, not one of which built its own boilers. They all bought the boilers, and they did not buy even the same kind. The Jarvis had Parsons' turbines and Thornycroft boilers, another well known type of boiler; the Jovett had Nonuand boilers, and the Henley had Curtis turbines. In the matter of turbines, some are equipped with the Parsons' type and some with the Curtis-Farrow boilers, it all depends on the specification put in by the admiralty. No matter where you go, the machinery for those vessels is bought from well known manufacturers. It is the same with the electric plant. I am satisfied that there is not a shipbuilding yard in the world that makes its own electric plant. It is arrant nonsense to talk about it. They buy their electric plant from manufacturers, and get, not only a better article, but a cheaper article. The same thing applies to boilers and to engines, they do not manufacture either of them. Nor do they manufacture their own armor plate, though I believe Vickers Sons & Maxim do. In the United States there is not a solitary concern that manufactures its own armor plate or guns.

I have taken more time than I intended to take in dealing with this matter, but I was compelled to do so because of the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, when he said that we could not build those vessels in Canada because it would cost $45,000,000 or $50,000,000 to build the plants necessary to complete the vessels. He even said that we could not roll steel plates. It has been stated a number of times, by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and has never been contradicted, that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company have had for three or four years the machinery required to roll steel plates for the construction of steel ships, and they are ready to install the plant if they have the business to do. They have not done the business because they have had no demand for steel plates.

But give the people of Canada a chance to do the business, and I have no fear whatever that there will be enough energy and pluck in the business firms of Canada to carry it on successfully. But you will never have it done unless you give them the opportunity. My hon. friends opposite are not living up to the traditions of their party; they are not carrying out the traditions upon which their old chieftain fought, and on which they maintained themselves in power. They are playing a un-Conservative hand, and a un-Liberal hand, a hand that does not do justice to the Liberals or to the Conservatives, or to Canadians of any stripe of politics. If my hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries cannot offer some better reasons for this unconstitutional proposition, he had better revise his policy and get down to something lake real business common-sense.

Some figures were given by my hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries last evening which, I think, are very illuminating. My hon. friend stated that the Fore River Shipbuilding Company referred to by the hon. member for St. John, was practically bankrupt, and that it had been sold out to the Bethlehem Steel Company for $600,000 of preferred bonds and $600,000 of other bonds. He admitted that, in addition, that company had to pay all the liabilities of the old company. He did not say how much there was in the form of bonds, though no doubt there would be a large amount. He admitted that the balance sheet of the company a year ago showed that they had asets amounting to $3,631,000. Now Sir, the facts are that the Fore River Shipbuilding Company, with a plant worth $3,600,00, has been able during the last ten years to build over 100 vessels. That is the important point to me, and I think it is the important point for Canada, that a shipbuilding plant which cost less than $4,000,000 is able to build the finest type of battleship in the world today.

That is the lesson which I want my hon. friends opposite to take home to themselves, and which I think every Canadian should take home to himself from the statement made by the hon. minister of marine and fisheries. And if they can build ships in the United States, they can build them in Canada. All this talk of the hon. minister of marine and fisheries about a $50,000,000 plant being required is simply nonsense. It is only put forward to draw the people of Canada away from the real issue, and to try to prove to them that we cannot build ships without the expenditure of an enormous sum of money. My hon. friend is simply following out the unfair statement put forward by Mr. Winston Churchill in his memorandum to the prime minister on the 10th of March.

I do not wish to enter into the discussion between my hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries (Mr. Hazen) and my hon. friend from St. John city (Mr. Pugsley) about the construction of works in St. John from a political standpoint. I do not intend to go into that discussion at all. I will leave it to these two hon. gentlemen to settle it in the future. I have no doubt they will have an opportunity to settle it and the opportunity cannot come a day too soon to suit me or to suit my hon. friend from St. John. They will settle it themselves as to the political end of it. But I want to discuss the business end of it for a few minutes. The hon. minister of marine and fisheries has made the statement three times during the course of this debate in my presence, and once or twice when I was not here, that he had refused to enter into this contract because he had a memorandum in the department of naval affairs stating that these vessels would be obsolescent before they were constructed, which, in every day language, means, I suppose, that they would be of no use by the time they were built.

Mr. Lemieux: That was a concocted memorandum.

Mr. Carvell: I do not know whether it was or not, but I believe it was. I cannot conceive of a responsible official, such as this gentleman, Commander Roper, on the very day before a general election—

Mr. Lemieux: And without being asked.

Mr. Carvell:—when the policy of constructing ships in Canada was one of the principal policies of the government then in existence, and the principal policy in the province of Quebec, leaving a memorandum of that kind without being asked and of his own motion. It simply is not common sense. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was his minister for something like two weeks and during that time he never made reference to it. Yet that is the memorandum which the minister of marine and fisheries states he found in the department.

Mr. Lemieux: My hon. friend might add that a year previously the same Commander Roper expressed a radically different view about the Canadian navy, and for having expressed that view, he was threatened by the hon. minister for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with being brought before the bar of the house.

Mr. Carvell: I remember that incident very distinctly indeed. But even if the incident referred to by my hon. friend from Rouville had never taken place, I repeat there is no responsible official, no man who knows as much as Commander Roper does, who would dare do such a thing, who would ever conceive of doing such a thing. Imagine an official preparing a memorandum the day before the general election condemning the government on a certain line of policy which was being discussed at the polls! It is not conceivable. The only reasonable supposition is that that he prepared that memorandum afterwards and dated it back. It is due to this house and the people of the country that this man Roper, if he is still in the employ of the government, should be brought back to Canada,brought before the bar ofthe house and compelled to say, when he did write it. There is some proof of it somewhere. There is probably a stenographer somewhere around Ottawa who wrote that article, and if we could find him we would know how it was concocted. It was the most ridiculous proposition that I ever heard of since I have been in the house of commons. My hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries falls back on a report like that as a justification for refusing to carry out the agreement. Why does he ont come out like a man and say that he did not cary out this agreement Because the Nationalists of Quebec would not let him do it? Does he suppose that he is fooling anybody in Canada when he tells them this cock-and-bull story? Does he suppose that every man who reads and thinks does not know why he did not carry out this agreement? Does he not know that his leader issued manifesto after manifesto, in Quebec and in other parts of the country, all condemning the Laurier naval policy? When my hon. friend came into office, of course, he could not sign the contract. Of course, he could not enter into a policy which he had fought and which the Nationalists had fought in the province of Quebec. He turned it down because he had to. I am almost ashamed that a man representing my own province should come here and put forth the finding of this memorandum as a reason why he did not sign that contract.

The Chairman: I think the hon. gentleman is using strong words.

Mr. Carvell: I do not wish to say anything that is unparliamentary. I am not saying anything against the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, but I am giving my own opinion of his action and stating how I feel about it. I wat to say something about the obsolescence of these vessels that the Laurier government were ready to contract for and for which tenders were in the possession of the naval department when the present government came into power. The tenders were to build these ships in St. John. My hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries may say that my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that if this government had signed the contract they might have been built on the St. Lawrence. If the government had signed the contract these vessels might have been built at Montreal, Sydney or Halifax, but let me tell the hon. minister of marine and fisheries that the tender which he found when he came into office and the deposit of $100,000 which had not been returned were not for building ships in the city of Montreal, but for building ships in the city of St. John, and he knows it. The people of St. John do not care about what might have happened if the government had gone on and done this, that or some other thing, but the question is: Why did not the minister of marine and fisheries sign that contract and why did he not allow these ships to be built in St. John? That is the question we ask him and that is the question that we are going to continue to ask him. He may say that he has Commander Roper's statement that these ships would be obsolescent before they were completed. I turn again to Burgoyne's Naval Annual, page 345, where reference is made to the type of vessel for which tenders have been called and where Messrs. Cammell, Laird & Co., had agreed to construct in St. John for, I think, $1,900,000.

An hon. member: Carried.

Mr. Carvell: Do not get excited about it being carried. Probably there will be some little formalities yet before it is carried. My hon. friends might as well remain patient over it. The tender for construction of these vessels in St. John was $1,950,000 without armament and stores, which latter would amount to $250,000, and these sums added together would make $2,200,000 for each vessels. These are the vessels that should have been built in St. John. Will give the committee a statement with reference to the type of vessel which it was proposed to build. It is the Bristol type, displacement, 4,820 tons; designed initial horse-power, 22,000; speed, 25 knots. Then these vessels were to be armed with two six-inch quick-firing guns, ten four-inch quick-firing guns and four machine guns, or altogether sixteen guns. That is the type of vessel for which the old government asked tenders and for which a contract would have been signed.

The very latest type of cruiser which the British admiralty is beginnig to build is the Nottingham which will be completed in 1914, or posibly 1915. The very latest word with reference to this class of vessel gives a displacement of only 5,440 tons, or about ten per cent. greater than the tonnage of the Bristol class. It has a designed initial horse-power of 25,000, a speed of 25.5 knots and its armament consists of nine six-inch quick-firing guns, four three-inch quick-firing guns, four machine guns and one light gun, or eighteen guns. That vessel has not ten per cent. greater displacement than the Bristol type, it is only ten per cent. greater in tonnage, it is practically no longer and no wider, it has little more horse-power and has only half a knot extra speed.

There is very little difference between the Bristol and the last word of the British admiralty in cruiser construction, and yet that is the ship which my friend Roper and his friend the minister of marine say will be obsolescent before it is built in 1916. I wonder if the minister of marine has ever gone to the least research to satisfy himself of the truthfulness of this man Roper's report. Obsolescent! Why, in 1916 the proposed Canadian ships would be right in line with the very latest vessels in possession of the British admiralty.

Look at what the Australians did, and I have never heard anyone in this house on either side find fault with the Australians as not knowing what they are about. They went to England and at first had their vessels constructed there, but I am happy to say the Australians have given up that foolish and unpatriotic policy, and they are now building their vessels at home. The last of the Australian vessels was launched only this last year, and I do not think anyone can say that it was obsolescent. At first the Australian government purchased three destroyers in England, and they now have three building in the shipyards at Sydney, Australia.

Let us compare the Australian destroyers with the destroyers we were to build and we will see how obsolescent ours would be as compared with theirs. Our destroyers were something over 600 tons displacement and the Australian 700 tons; our destroyers were to be 25 knots, and the Australian 26 knots, and the armament was practically the same. We would build exactly the same kind of destroyers as did the Australians; and yet Mr. Roper and the minister say that if we had built these destroyers they would be obsolete before being launched in 1916. I mention these facts merely to show the ground on which the minister of marine and fisheries justifies himself for refusing to carry out that contract. Of course, the ground he publicly acknowledges is not the real ground at all. He did not refuse to carry out the contract because the vessels would be obsolete; he did refuse to carry it out because his Quebec Nationalist allies would not allow him to, and from the standpoint of the Nationalists they would be big fools if they did. Do not forget that the Nationalists in Quebec won out in the last election, and they are winning out now, and they are going to win out so long as the right hon. gentleman remains in power. It is true, they absent themselves once in a while from a vote, when it does not please them; but they always come back. Just so long as the minister of public works holds out his hands with the loaves and fishes, the Nationalists of Quebec will come around to vote when it is necessary to save the government.

Mr. Carvell: I do not think there is much chance of the government losing the Nationalists, but if they are going to hold them they must not build ships in Canada; they must not recruit men in Canada, and they must dismiss the men who already have been recruited in Canada. That is the one condition of the support of the Nationalists, and so long as the Prime Minister complies with that condition he will have their loyal support. At all events, that is the reason the minister of marine did not sign the contract to build the vessels at St. John and not because the vessels would be obsolescent before they were completed.

When the prime minister introduced this measure on the 5th day of December last, he proposed it on the sole ground that a condition of emergency existed in the British Empire, and that if this contribution were not made the British Empire might go to pieces. True, the prime minister did not put it in as plain English as I do now, but that was the substance of what he said. And, if my right hon. friend omitted anything in that direction, it was supplied by his followers who were allowed to speak during the first fortnight of the debate. One after the other of them got up and delivered himself of the German scare as the sole argument for sending this $35,000,000 out of the country. It may be well to call attention to the language used by the prime minister on that memorable occasion, the 5th of December, and it will be found that the only reason he gave for this proposal was directed to the fear that some fine day the German navy might descend upon the British Isles. He read it with the greatest satisfaction, and it was applauded to the echo by his followers. In this statement he practically set forth that there was an emergency. Let me read it to the house again:

"It may be fairly asked what we would do if we were in power today with regard to a great question of this kind. It seems to me that our plain course and duty would be this: The government of this country are able to ascertain and to know, if they take the proper action for that purpose, whether the conditions which face the empire at this time in respect of naval defence are grave. If we were in power we would endeavor to find that out, to get a plain, unvarnished answer to that question, and if the answer to that question, based upon the assurance of the government of the Mother Country and the report of the naval experts of the admiralty were such—and I think it would be such—as to demand instant and effective action by this country, then I would appeal to parliament for immediate and effective aid, and if parliament did not give immediate and effective aid I would appeal from parliament to the people of the country."

Any reasonable man must take that to mean that he went to England and found that a real condition of emergency existed, a condition which required immediate and effective aid. If there was any question as to his intention or the grounds upon which he was applying to parliament, his succeeding remarks dispelled any doubt as to that. They are as follows:

"Then, Sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be consulted. I do not know whether I have made my position clear, but I have done so according to my humble capacity. I think the question of Canada's co-oeration upon a permanent basis in imperial defence involves very large and wide considerations."

That was his belief as to the condition of affairs in December, 1912. He asked parliament to grant $35,000,000 on the ground that a real emergency existed at that time. After this money was granted, he intended to take up the question of a permanent policy. I want to be fair to him. I want at least to be logical in any conclusion that I may draw from the facts that I am giving to the house. I wonder if my right hon. friend could find any man on the other side of the house who would argut that a condition of emergency exists today. Even the Montreal Star has given up that idea. About six weeks ago when people were getting away from the crux of the question, that paper came out with an editorial, in which it said: They are forgetting the emergency. Why, the Montreal Star has forgotten it now. No reasonable thinking man in the British Empire would say that there is an emergency at the present time.

My right hon. friend in his address of the 5th of December, made the air lurid in his description of the condition of affairs existing in the North Sea. He told us how many vessels the Germans had in the North Sea, and how many the British had in the North Sea. We heard the thunder roll and saw the lightning flash. The battle of Armageddon was at hand, and the German navy was ready to come over and to blow us up at any moment. Many things have happened since that time. When my right hon. friend made his speech in December, 1912, a condition of affairs existed in Europe which made it very easy for him to make an argument even though it was not based on facts. There was a war between Turkey and the Balkans which threatened to set Europe on fire. Turkey was humiliated and practically driven out of Europe, and finally had to come to the powers and say: We place ourselves entirely in your hands; do with us as you think best and we will be satisfied.

Then my friends got hope from another complication in Europe. The Montenegrins captured the fortess of Scutari and said that they were going to hold it. Every hon. member knows that Austria determined that Montenegro should not be permitted to hold Scutari, but that Scutari should become Austrian or Albanian. It looked as if there was going to be war over that. Every paper came out with scare headlines; but Scutari has now been abandoned by the Montenegrins, and Europe is at peace and at rest as it has not been for the last forty years.

The German Empire for the last ten years has been spending enormous sums on its navy. It has transferred its energies now to its army. It is increasing its army on a peace footing by about 250,000 men; and, in order to get the necessary funds, it has been compelled to resort to what I might call the expropriation of public property. It has had to assess a tax upon the property of the people which amounts almost to confiscation. France has increased her land forces by lengthening the term of service from two to three years. A new force has arisen in the Balkans.

A million armed men are there who are supposed to be the allies of Russia. The whole theatre of trouble in Europe has been transferred from the water to the land. So far as any person who thinks and reads can see, it will be generations before there will be any question of trouble on the ocean. If any trouble takes place in Europe in the future, it must be on the land. The German Empire, without any question whatever, has agreed to the proposition of restricting its construction of war vessels to the ratio of ten German vessels to sixteen British. With an agreement like that, why should we go into this un-Canadian and I might say unpatriotic proposition to send this money out of the country and to establish a condition of affairs which sooner or later must be broken by the people of Canada, and which cannot be broken without causing trouble either here or in the Mother Country?

These are matters which I think my right honorable friend would do well to consider carefully before he attempts to force this matter through by closure, as we understand he intends doing. I thing he will have some difficulty in getting it through in any other way. I am not making a threat; I am only stating a fact. If we were justified in December, 1912, in refusing to agree to this un-Canadian proposition, we are a hundred times more justified in refusing to agree to it now, when the very reason put forward by my hon. friend for its existence has absolutely failed and has ceased to exist. I do not wonder that he does not attempt to justify this proposition at this stage of the debate. I do not wonder that he has left the matter to the minister of marine and fisheries, who has tried to draw the attention of the people away from the fact that we can build ships in Canada, by stating that a ship-building firm in the United States has got into financial difficulties and has been sold out to a larger firm. That will not put it out of existence but will enable it to continue on a wider basis than in the past. I do not wonder that my right hon. friend will not allow any of his followers to make a speech or to endeavor to justify this proposition. I do not wonder that none of his newspaper followers in Canada have attempted to do such a thing. The reading public are reasonable beings. They are able to read the signs of the times, just the same as hon. members on this side of the House are. They know that condition of emergency has ceased to exist. They know that the idea of rocing this bill through is taken up only because the government are compelled to do so at the behest of their Nationalist followers, and not because it is necessary for Canada or for the British Empire.

Even at this late date, I consider that the right hon. the prime minister would not lose in prestige; that he would gain in prestige; that he would be stamped as a man of big proportions if he would have the manhood to say: Conditions have changed since I introduced this bill in 1912. The condition of emergency which I thought existed then has ceased to exist. There is no danger of trouble arising in Great Britain. An agreement has been entered into between Great Britain and Germany by which naval constuction shall be limited in the ratio of sixteen to ten. He can give all these reasons without any loss of prestige, and, indeed, I think he would gain a great deal of prestige if he were to stand up and say: The conditions have changed; therefore I will withdraw this bill. If he would do that, there would be no trouble about agreeing on a policy which would be of great benefit to Canada as a whole.

My hon. friend has said that, although we are now giving this money, we are going to have a permanent policy. My impression is that we have the permanent policy before us now. In introducing this bill, my hon. friend said that the Canadian ships were to be stationed in the North sea, and he and those of his followers whom he allowed to speak during the first two or three weeks of this debate placed great emphasis upon the conditions in the North Sea. They wanted the ships to be in the firing line when Armagedon comes; they wanted to be represented not by their men, who would be of some use, but by their money; they wanted to be where there would be no danger that the sons of Canada would be disembowelled by German bullets. When it was suggested by hon. gentlemen on this side of the house that, if we had a fleet unit on the Atlantic, that fleet unit could get to the North Sea in six days, we were told that the whole danger would have passed over before the fleet could get there. That argument was made use of up to March 10, when my right hon. friend read this remarkable production from the Right Hon. Winston Churchill. My right hon. friend hesitated long and anxiously before producing that letter; I do not wonder that he did so. I am surprised that a responsible minister of the crown in Britain should write a letter which contains an insult to one-half the Canadian people and a libel upon the other half—an insult when he says that the people of Canada have not the brains, the pluck, the energy and the ability to do what other countries have done, and a libel upon our workmen in Canada when he says that there cannot be found in this country men to drive rivets, build cranes or man shipyards. He even intimated that we had no soil in Canada sufficiently solid to support the ways for holding a ship.

As I say, I do not wonder that my right hon. friend hesitated long and anxiously before he presented that memorandum to parliament. I do not wonder that when it was read in this house it created a storm that my right hon. friend did not anticipate; I do not wonder that it created a tempest not only in parliament but throughout the country. I do not wonder that his own party papers, as well as the Liberal press, condemned him and his party for repeating that libel upon the Canadian people. But the storm created in Canada was but a gentle zephyr compared with the storm that took place in Great Britain when this matter became known. It is well known that in Britain, not only the Conservative press but the Liberal papers supporting the Hon. Mr. Churchill, condemned him in the severest possible manner for his action. An hon. member of the British parliament gave notice of a resolution of censure upon the admiralty for writing such a letter and for offering such an insult to the laboring people of the Dominion of Canada, and it was only on account of the exigencies of British politics that this gentleman was not allowed to make his motion of censure. It is well known in England that if the members of the British parliament were given a chance to tell Mr. Churchill what they thought of him, he would be driven out of the government, and, as in this event such great reforms as home rule, the abolition of plural voting, and other great social reforms now being projected in England might go to the wall, for their own self-preservation the Liberal party in Britain abstained from giving this gentleman an opportunity of placing upon the first lord of the admiralty that censure which the parliamentarians of Britain would like to mete out to him for offering this insult to Canada. Then Mr. Churchill had to do something to pacify public opinion in Britain, and the naval emergency was shifted from the North Sea to Gibraltar; the Canadian ships were linked up with the Sultan of Perak and the Malay States.

At first the Right Hon. Winston Churchill would have us believe that the Canadian ships in this flying squadron were to be associated with those of Australia and New Zealand. But Australia said two or three years ago: We will have none of your flying squadron; we are looking after our own affairs, building our own navy, manning and owning it, and if the time comes when the British Empire is in need of aid we shall place the ships at the disposal of the British admiralty. It is true that New Zealand had adopted a policy of contribution, and that she handed one ship over to the British Empire. But even New Zealand has gone back on that policy, and, if we correctly interpret the remarks of Colonel Allen, who was in this country last week, it is evident that New Zealand will have nothing more to do with contributions, and intends to pursue the manly course of building her own ships, manning and maintaining them, and, like Australia, placing them at the disposal of the British admiralty when the hour of danger should arise. That is the course Canada should adopt.

When Winston Churchill transferred these vessels to Gibraltar, while he may have pleased some people in Britain, did not please my right hon. friend. The Conservative party in Canada saw that the whole argument they had been putting up to the people of Canada was by this course swept away. For two months subsequent to December 5, 1912, they tried to make the people of Canada believe that the vessels must be in the North Sea when Armageddon comes, to fight the Germans,but Winston Churchill now says: We do not want those vessels in the North Sea; we have the ships and the men and the money and the resources, and we can take care of ourselves; we are going to send these Canadian vessels to Gibraltar. Then my hon. friends opposite saw that their argument was entirely shattered, and, while I have no actual knowledge of the matter, I can quite conceive of the wires being kept red-hot with cablegrams going across to Churchill from my right hon. friend saying: Look at the hole you have put me in. Then Mr. Churchill says: I must placate my friends in Canada. It is true we can take care of ourselves in the North sea; it is true that we have made arrangements with Germany by which future naval construction will be reduced to the ratio of 16 to 10; it is true that we do not want the Canadian warships in the North sea, and it is equally true we have not got the men to man them even if they were there.

Mr. Burnham—The hon. gentleman has spoken very glowingly of Australia. Is it true or not true that Australia considers its navy a component part of the navy of the Empire?

Mr. Carvell—It is both true and not true.

Mr. Burnham—That is just what I expected.

Mr. Carvell—It is true in time of trouble, it is not true in time of peace, and if any man can conceive any better Canadian doctrine than that I would like to hear him speak now or forever hold his peace.

Mr. Burnham—It is independent, that is what it is.

Mr. Carvell—My hon. friend must not get excited over independence, we will discuss that later, and I hope my hon. friend will be permitted to make a speech on that subject. My right hon. friend ought to see that there are dozens of his followers anxious to give the public their views on this question. Free speech never hurt any country or any party. Every time one of my hon. friends opposite asks a question it is an illustration of this great doctrine of free speech and of the danger attending the method of burking free speech which has been adopted by this government. The Australian fleet, I believe, the moment there is a possibility of danger to the British Empire, will be placed unreservedly under the British Admiralty.

Mr. Burnham—Is that arranged now?

Mr. Carvell—I believe it is.

Mr. Burnham—Is that the way with the Canadian navy?

Mr. Carvell—I believe it is.

Mr. Burnham—Will your leader say that?

Mr. Carvell—My hon. friend has not the floor now.

Mr. Burnham—You dare not do it, you dare not do it.

Mr. Carvell—I will tell my hon. friend what will happen, so far as I am concerned. So far as I am concerned the Canadian navy will be at the disposal of the British Admiralty the moment the time of emergency comes or it is required for the defence of the empire, and if my right hon. friend has any doubt about that let him move an amendment to sections 22 and 23 of the Canadian Naval Service Act in order to improve it in this respect; then he will see if every man on this side of the House will not vote for him. My right hon. friend dare not amend the Canadian Naval Service Act in that way. He is the greatest sinner of them all in this regard, because when speaking on this question at one time he harked back to an answer given by the right hon. leader of the opposition to a supposed question when the Naval Service Act was under consideration by the committee of the whole house.

He stated a certain condition of affairs and asked the right hon. gentleman what would happen under those conditions under the Canadian Naval Service Act, and the right hon. leader of the opposition gave the only logical answer which could be given, the logical answer that any hon. gentleman would give, and which I for one would never for a moment go back on. If my right hon. friend fears that some action might be taken by a future Canadian government that should not be taken, because of the wording of sections 22 and 23 of the Canadian Naval Service Act, and these are the only ones referring to it, I say to him: Amend the act and put it exactly in the same form as the Australian and New Zealand act and he will not hear a word of dissent from this side of the house. If that were done we would have a Canadian navy controlled by the dominion government in time of peace and at the service of the empire in time of war.

Mr. Middlebro—Is my hon. friend of the same mind as the right hon. leader of the opposition, who said that if circumstances arose again the same as those existing at the time of the Crimean war he would not send the Canadian navy to the assistance of Great Britain?

Mr. Carvell—I was not on this earth at the time of the Crimean war, neither was my hon. friend; and, while I know something about the history of that war, I do not care what would have happened in 1854; what I am talking about is what is happening in 1913 and what will happen in the future and I am telling my hon. friend what would be my attitude in case a Canadian navy were built and certain conditions arose. Under the Canadian Naval Service act there is not a word, line or expression which prevents the Canadian government from doing anything they have a mind to; they may send the Canadian navy to the British admiralty any day they want to, or they may send them to the Crimea or anywhere else, the only condition is that if they transfer it to the British admiralty they must call parliament together within ten or fifteen days to provide funds.

They must do the samt with regard to the navy as with regard to the militia. The Militia act, passed a few years after Confederation, provides that if you send the militia of Canada out of the country you must call parliament together to provide funds. The same thing applies to the navy. The Militia act provides that the militia must be controlled by the Canadian government and by nobody else; but if the militia be handed over to the British government a new condition of affairs arises and parliament must be called together. If my right hon. friend or any of his followers have any doubt about that let the prime minister bring down an amendment to the Canadian Naval Service act which will eliminate the bogy which they profess to see in those two clauses or any other clauses.

An hon. member: And you will vote against it.

Mr. Carvell: And I will vote for it. My right hon. friend dare not bring in such an amendment, his Nationalist allies will not allow it. I think he is having enough trouble with the Nationalist wing of his party now without attempting to amend the Naval Service act. One minister of the crown said last year that they would abolish the Canadian Naval Service act. The prime minister seems to have kept them quiet by arguments or promises, promises I presume, and they havt remained quiet and have allowed this session to go on without demanding the repeal of the Naval Service act.

It is true that they have not all voted with the government on all occasions, but enough of them have voted with the government to keep them in power and I presume that the government will be able to get through the session without repealing the Naval Service act. But if they have any doubt about this side of the house or any doubt about the efficiency of the Canadian Naval Service act and want to make it palmer that the Canadian navy will automatically pass into the hands of the admiralty in time of war, all they have to do is to change the wording of the act and they will not find any necessity of applying closure to pass such a measure through the house.

At 6 o'clock, house resumed, and then took recess.

(To be continued).

THE SENATE DOWN TO WORK

Many Bills Discussed and Advanced a Stae—Some Critginism of West India Agreement.

Ottawa, May 12—In the senate tonight the bill amending the dominion police act was given third reading, as was the bill amending the Intercolonial Employes Protective Fund act.

The bill to control wireless telegraphy was put through committee after the various clauses had been explained by Hon. Mr. Lougheed.

In committee on the bill to confirm the agreement between Canada and the West Indies, Senator Domville stated that he could see no prospect for trade expansion. Canada needed some West Indian sugar, but as to the West Indies there appeared to be little likelihood of Canada's products being taken.

Sir MacKenzie Bowell stated that when he was minister of customs it had been found that some of the darkest and poorest looking sugar gave the highest saccharine test. He had introduced the system prevailing today of ascertaining the strength of sugar. He felt that there was opportunity of sending large quantities of goods to the West Indies if Canadian manufacturers and producers sought the trade intelligently.

This was a bargain which would tend to bind outlying portions of the empire more closely together and should be ratified.

Sir George Ross asked if the agreement provided for improved steamship service.

Hon. Mr. Lougheed said that such a service was provided for. In an answer to the question he stated that the steamers shall have accommodation for both freight and passengers business and the rates shall be no higher than those to American ports. The bill was reported without amendment.

A bill to provide advances to the Quebec harbor commissioners; a bill to incorporate the Vancouver harbor commissioners; a bill amending the petroleum and naphtha inspection act, were advanced through the committee stage and the bill amending the Ottawa Mint act was given a second reading.

The senate adjourned until tomorrow afternoon.

SAW MILL BURNED

Luther B. Smith's saw mill at Centre Bliesville, Sunbury county, was destroyed by fire on last Friday. The mill, which was valued at $13,000, was a total loss and $4,000 worth of lumber which had been left over from last season also was destroyed. The mill was a new one having been built to replace another which was also destroyed by fire.

The loss was partially covered by insurance to the extent of $12,000 with the Royal and Union of Paris insurance companies, for which Machum & Foster are agents.

Mr. Smith had recently put on some additional insurance to cover improvements to the mill and had arranged with the inspector for the company to visit the mill on Friday. The owner and the insurance man got off the train in time to see the mill in flames.

The mill was not in operation at the time and the cause of the fire is unknown. It is believed that it must have been due to some one's carelessness in dropping a match around the mill.

Baked stuffed tomatoes or peppers will be much improved if brushed over with olive oil.

Good table napkins for summer use are made of cotton crepe. They need no ironing.

WANTED

WANTED—Young men and take the training course f the Hartford, Connecticut, Re wages. Good positions. Re quired. Miss Jessie J. Glen, ent of Nurses, 30 Washington ford, Conn.

WANTED—By April the 1 and housemaid. Apply Mrs. David Robertson, Th Rothesay, N. B.

WANTED—Housemaid; ref quired. Apply Mrs. J. M 70 Leinster street.

AGENTS WANT

RELIABLE representative meet the tremendous d fruit trees throughout New B present. We wish to secure th good men to represent us a general agents. The special int in the fruit-growing busines Nashwick offers exceptional o for men of enterprise. We c manent position and liberal right men. Stone & Wellingto Ont.

WANTED immediately; relia good pay weekly; outfit sive stock and territory. Our valuable. For particulars wri Nursery Company, Toronto,

SALESMAN WANT

Travelling Salesmen

to sell Watches, Diamonds, Jew cals and Fancy Goods. Salary mission paid. Yearly contract. our salesmen are now making $100.00 weekly. Now on sale, K. Gold Watch, Waltham 15 J ment. While they last $19.5 $40.00 to retail. Good as repr money back. Write for our logue.

THE NATIONAL 326 St. Lawrence Boul MONTREAL, - -

No Summer Vaca

We would greatly enjoy o many of our students come fro tances, and are anxious to be situations as son as possible will be continued without inter Then, St. John's cool summ makes study during the warm just as pleasant as at any othe Students can enter at any t

Send Catal S. K Pri

EGG CIRCLES FOR P. E. IS

T. A. Benson Tells Methods for Egg H —Poultry Products to Consumer.

Thursday,

"People in Prince Edward taking the poultry question said T. A. Benson, dominion presentative, of Prince Edward The Telegraph last evening. thoroughly recognized the valu selves, the consumer, and the a flourishing poultry trade, an centrating that part of their e devoted to the raising of blac developing the poultry industry

For some time, Mr. Benson partment has been trying to e farmers in all parts of the do properly breed, feed, house an take care of the fowls in a scie and it has been found that the ner in which the industry may sped, the stock improved, the ried fresh and of a respectabl the middleman, where unnecess ted, is to establish "egg circle

"The organization of these is simple," Mr. Benson said. farmers of a suitable district several fairly progressive men. is formed with a president, vice secretary, business manager, an of directors. Sometimes there sums of money deposited by th to cover their first small ex other times these have been def contribution of eggs. The opera circle consists of the eggs bein by a business manager, who commission, not by salary, and to the buyer. It has