

what the Right Hon. Winston Churchill is going to do; when you place yourself in his hands, you may find yourself in any part of the world. There is a change of purpose also. When the ships were first proposed on 5th December, they were to defend the Empire. Mr. Churchill shows that those ships, which are to be contributed, will cruise the five seas, visiting the different colonies—a very pacific mission indeed, and very unlike the emergency which was described to us in the latter days of last year.

I also think there is a change in the point of view in respect to the question which was discussed by the right hon. the Prime Minister as to Canada's representation in some sort of federal council governing the defensive forces of the Empire. We hear nothing of that now. The Right Hon. Lewis Harcourt settled that, and, with the other things I have mentioned, it will disappear into the limbo of things forgotten. Since this discussion opened there have been other incidents which confirm us in our point of view. Australia has been perfecting her fleet, she has established her naval college, and declarations have been made by her ministers that they do not propose to embark upon any other policy than that of an Australian navy. If the view is of any importance to us, Admiral Henderson has expressed himself as filled with regret that Canada should take the retrograde step she is now taking, and that she is not carrying out the arrangement originally entered into in 1909.

Another thing that has been made clear by this discussion is the purpose of the Government in asking us to vote the \$35,000,000. The right hon. the Prime Minister made a speech which we commended at the time as being moderate in tone, and fair in words. He proposed, as his own scheme, the building of three dreadnoughts which he described, as a debt to the Mother Country, but upon which he proposed to still hold his grasp, so that those ships might become the nucleus of a Canadian navy. He must surely have expected the Liberal party to come into power very soon when he made the latter proposition. I do not think that those ships will last very long, five or six years at the outside, and if he thought they were to come back as the nucleus of a Canadian navy he must have thought that the Liberal party would be in power pretty soon, because, from all that has taken place up to the present, I am satisfied that the Conservative party has no intention of forming a Canadian navy. His own argument was distinctly against a local naval system. He cited to us the extent of the liability of Canada to the Mother Country in the matter of defence, I think he said it was between three

Mr. McCRAVEY.

and four hundred million dollars. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) followed up his argument and quoted figures to show the impossibility of building ships in this country; the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) showed how expensive it would be to man ships with Canadians, and how cheap it would be to get seamen in the Old Country at twenty-six cents a day; my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) made an argument so distinctly against any proposed autonomy that his speech led in only one direction, that of a central fleet; my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) suggested that the tendency of our policy of a Canadian navy was separatist; and my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was very clear on the one navy idea. When it came to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White), he said that he was not in for a contribution, that if he believed that there would be other contributions he would not support the policy. Yet the strongest argument he adduced in his speech was one that makes it necessary that there shall be other contributions. He pointed out, in opposition to what the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the right hon. Prime Minister had said, that these ships, which we are to give now, are essential to the naval programme of Great Britain for 1916, in the words of the Right Hon. Winston Churchill. However much my hon. friend the Minister of Finance may declare that he is against contribution, he is convinced by the one argument which makes it necessary that we should keep those ships in the battle line because they are to be incorporated in the British fleet. I can understand one who holds the view that these ships shall be independent of the British programme saying that we may at some time take them back, but I cannot understand any one who believes that they must become part of the building programme of the British naval authorities thinking that anything else must happen than that we must repeat, and repeat, and repeat that contribution. At last the silence on the Government side of the House has been broken by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). That hon. gentleman expresses regret that these ships are not given outright. I would like to say to him that he need not feel so badly about it. They are given outright.

Mr. CARVELL: They will go all right.

Mr. McCRAVEY: They will go all right. I agree with him that the language is rather ungracious and that when you are going to give a thing you might as well say so. It was rather impolite to put it in that way. If it is a matter of showing how much we think of the British people, it