

be, I think the proposition contained in the Bill before the House is infinitely better than any other proposition that has been made. I think also that it will give an impetus to our merchant marine, and will make it a great credit to Canada. To-day, notwithstanding that our trade and commerce are growing so rapidly, only ten per cent of it is carried in Canadian bottoms. I think a country that is situated as ours is, with extensive coasts on two oceans, and an export trade that must be done almost entirely by water, we should do something to increase our shipbuilding industry, so that instead of ten per cent of our commerce being carried in Canadian bottoms, fifty per cent of it will be carried in Canadian bottoms before the expiration of the next ten years. I think also that a Canadian navy, in case a difficulty really were to arise—and I do not think there is any more probability of difficulty arising between Canada and any other nation than there is between Germany and England—but I say if difficulty really were to arise a Canadian navy would be a great assistance to the British navy and an effective support of our militia on land. With the construction of the new Weland canal to a depth of 27 feet from Hamilton to Selkirk on Lake Erie, 40 miles distant from the international boundary, and with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal our navy could pass up into the interior of Canada entirely on Canadian waters, and a Canadian navy could co-operate in case of emergency with our Canadian militia to much better advantage than two Dreadnoughts in England could possibly do. In comparing our position, and the position of our navy with that of Australia, I can only say that, from the remarks I have heard and from the newspaper comments I have read, I would much prefer the position of Canada, owning her own navy, built by herself, to the position of the Australian navy, to which the British government contributes.

While perhaps it has not been said in so many words, it has been said in substance that it is necessary, in order to show our loyalty to Britain, to contribute \$25,000,000 in money. I think Britain has every confidence in the loyalty of Canada. Canada is loyal to the last man and the last dollar. It is entirely unnecessary to demonstrate our loyalty by a contribution of \$25,000,000; in fact, there is no question about our loyalty except as it is raised occasionally for party advantage. Our trained men would be of equal advantage in case of a naval difficulty to Great Britain as our contingents were in South Africa. To question our loyalty and to read quotations in support of such argument is, to my mind, a mere juggling with words and has no real substance or meaning. The insinua-

tions in respect to Canada's tin pot navy are as unfair to Great Britain as they are to Canada because our navy, except in minor particulars, will be on exactly the same plan and basis as the British navy. Therefore, if we speak about Canada's tin pot navy, we have to say that Britain has a tin pot navy also with the exception of her eight Dreadnoughts. There is no reason why we should not excel as Canadians in the construction of naval vessels and vessels of the merchant marine. We have excelled along military lines wherever we have come in competition with military men of other portions of the empire. At Bisley we have not only carried off our fair average share of honors, but for a number of years past we have carried off very much more than our share; in fact, it is said that we have carried off nearly fifty per cent of the honors that are granted at these great meets of the empire's military men. In South Africa our contingents won distinction by their conduct on the field of battle. In the construction of the Ross rifle we have certainly carried off honors in being able to construct military weapons on a small scale, and I believe that if we only have courage we will be able to engage in naval construction with equal success. The cost cannot be so very great if at present our military expenditure only represents eighty cents per head. The naval cost is estimated at forty-five cents per head only for the completion of the vessels which, with interest on construction and maintenance, will make a total of \$1.25 per head. It would not seem to represent a very large increase in the expenditure and over rapid increase in population will in all probability by that time, not increase the per capita cost above the present 80 cents. But I believe that when we are expending eighty cents to see our products safely to the ocean ports we can afford to make a further expenditure for insurance on the high seas, even on commercial lines, of forty-five cents in order that our products may reach their destination without interruption. If we are going to be the granary of the empire in years to come it is necessary that we should have some naval defence for our coast. While not a military expert I have frequently paid visits to navy yards and know something of their equipment and methods, I may say that in actual warfare it is not expected that merchant marine can be protected by naval vessels during the whole course of the Atlantic voyage. If we had two Dreadnoughts placed at our disposal in the English channel they could not possibly be trusted to come out to Canada to escort our commerce over because they would require very considerable protection themselves. Therefore, two