

Are we to go back a hundred and fifty years to a Crown colony status and be dependent on the army and navy of the Mother Country in time of trouble? Are we going to continue to sponge on the British taxpayer? If so, it is a most humiliating position for this country, especially in view of what Canada did in the great war.

New Zealand and Australia have co-ordinated their naval policies, and to-day they have real, effective navies instead of a few fish trawlers. Following the example of those dominions, I think it would be a good thing to ask the British Government to have Admiral of the Fleet, Lord Beatty, make a report on the naval defence of Canada so that it may be available for the next Imperial Conference.

I am very much disappointed with the policy of the Government because had they continued the policy of building up a fleet unit we would obtain some tangible results. It has been said that, as an Empire, we came into being by the sea, and that we cannot exist without the sea. The sea is His, and He made it. Great Britain, as we all know, is primarily a maritime nation, and I think it will be generally agreed that Canada, with her 6,000 miles of coast lines on the Atlantic and Pacific, should also be, and is to a great extent, a maritime nation. She leads in rowing, canoeing, yachting, fishing and lumbering, but what opportunities do the Government propose to give our young men who excel in aquatic sports and would make good sailors, to develop themselves as mariners so that in peace or war the country could rely on them to man its merchant marine and its navy and fleet units? The only opportunities are in the shape of a couple of weeks' drill in fire halls or armouries each year! I disagree absolutely with this policy, for it cannot possibly be of any use to us. I venture to say that those landlubber, three-weeks-trained young men, on their first ocean trip, would prove toy sailors, and get seasick, and many in that time would be unable to even swim a stroke. They would be quite unsuitable to man the magnificent fleet of our First Lord of the Admiralty.

Last week the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) said the next war would be fought in the heavens above. I do not agree with him; I think the next war will be fought in the earth beneath. But apparently Canada's First Lord of the Admiralty is under the impression that the next war will be fought among the fishes in the waters under the earth. This magni-

ficent toy fleet of his, which is to be maintained at a cost of 17 cents per capita, will be a myth, so far as any effective defence for our shores goes: it may, however, keep a few fish in order.

The Prime Minister said that his Government was prepared to continue the naval policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier of 1910. In that year the Liberal party moved the following amendment in the House of Commons to the naval resolution proposed by the Borden Government:

This House regrets to learn the intention of the Government to indefinitely postpone the carrying out by Canada of a permanent naval policy.

It is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken at the present session to give effect actively and speedily to the permanent naval policy embodied in the Naval Service Act of 1910 passed pursuant to the resolution unanimously approved by this House in March 1909.

This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition by Canada under the above act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada, respectively, rather than by a contribution of money or ships, is the policy best calculated to afford relief to the United Kingdom in respect to the burden of Imperial naval defence, and in the words of the Admiralty memorandum, to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea and directly promote the security of the Dominions; and that the Government of Canada should take such steps as shall lead to the accomplishment of this purpose as speedily as possible.

That could be done under the act of 1910. I am informed that it is the intention to construct three battleships under his bill. If hon. gentlemen or the government of the day wanted four or five, they could build them wherever they pleased under the act of 1910.

Further on he says:

No disunion; the Admiralty and House of Commons all one in defence of the Empire; that is the position in which we should be to-day.

Again he says:

Under the Laurier Act of 1910 provision was made for the training of men on board training ships, and in naval schools and colleges, so that the ships, as soon as constructed, would be prepared to go to sea and fill their place in the naval defence of Canada and the Empire as the case might be.

That was the policy of the Liberal party. In conclusion he states the principles of the Liberal party in the matter of naval defence as follows:

It stands for the defence of the Empire, from Australia to the Pole. Not on the North sea alone, but on every sea where the British flag floats in time of danger.

Secondly, we stand for as many battleships of the most modern type as are required; at any rate to the limit of our resources.