

important industrial enterprises are being absorbed by larger enterprises, or are being combined into what are called mergers. And there is already some evidence that the result of these combinations and mergers is to enhance prices very materially as regards certain lines of goods necessarily consumed by the people of this country. Far be it from me to detract from the energy or enterprise of these captains of industry who, by their talents for organization, their financial genius and splendid optimism, have consummated what are known in this country as mergers but are known in other countries by harsher and less delectable appellations. It is our duty to study public questions and evolve policies on public issues in the light of the past history of other countries similarly circumstanced with ourselves, and I believe that the time has come to limit to some extent the exercise of those talents for promoting mergers recently so much in evidence in this Dominion. 'Predatory wealth' is a term that happily, so far has had no meaning or application in relation to our industrial finances and I conceive it to be the duty of parliament in so far as it may properly do so by legislation to make it absolutely impossible for that opprobrious expletive ever to become engrafted upon the language of this country.

There is only one other question that I should refer to, and that is the question of naval defence. That question has already been dealt with by my hon. friend from Berthier, but, as it is an important one, perhaps the House will pardon me even if I go over ground that he has covered. The resolution passed unanimously by this House on the 29th of March last calls for action on the part of the government for the purpose of crystallizing that resolution into an active and vigorous policy with respect to naval affairs in this country. I confess that I was in a haze as to what was best for Canada to do. Not being a military or naval man, I had to exercise such judgment as I was able to arrive at after having heard the speeches of the leaders of the House on that occasion. But I wanted to know also what naval experts thought of the policy of this country and through it of the policy of the Imperial government, and I was pleased to learn, some months after this resolution was passed, that Lord Charles Beresford had delivered himself on that question. Speaking at the Australian annual banquet in the city of London, on June 29 last, Lord Charles Beresford said:

The government was wise to ask a conference to assemble in this country to discuss this all-important matter. There was no doubt that the question of imperial defence was in the minds of the Dominions, because they had shown us at home that they thought we were

Mr. KYTE.

getting a bit sleepy, not looking facts in the face, and the fact was further emphasized by the offer of money for the purpose of building what were called Dreadnoughts, but which he preferred to call battleships. . . . The great object was to help one another, and he thought the best way was for the Dominions to make proposals for defending themselves.

The best investment for the colonies was to build cruisers with which to protect their trade routes. \*\*\*\*\*

The vessels should be under the administration and control of the Dominions, but in case of war ready to join the imperial fleet.

I confess that I was glad to observe that Lord Charles Beresford agrees with the policy of this House as regards the vote given on the 29th of March. I am pleased to see that the government felt called upon to make some practical move as regards the policy that was adopted on that occasion, and I observe that that resolution has been strictly adhered to. There appears to be some difference of opinion in this country as to what particular form Canada's assistance to naval defence should take, but so far as the hon. members of this House are concerned I think there will be no difference of opinion in view of the vote that was given here last session on that subject. Now, I have no strong views with regard to this question. A cash contribution is an alternative proposal: but it appears to me that that savours somewhat of feudalism, a spirit that we got away from hundred of years ago. I think Canada would do well to move slowly in this regard, to form the nucleus of a navy for its own coastal protection and for its own purposes as regards naval defence in co-operation with the imperial navy should occasion arise for co-operation with the stronger force. When the proposals come down, I have no doubt, there will be a discussion on the question, and, perhaps, with more light upon the subject we may all be disposed to give some further expression to our particular views in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, history affords us many instances of alliances having been formed among nations for the purpose of mutual assistance and support, to repel the attacks of other powers, and to assist each other in aggressive warfare. These alliances, however, having been based upon no higher law or nobler sentiment than fear on the one hand or hate on the other, if we except those sordid and selfish instincts, that frequently coveted the territory of some weak and unoffending neighbour, fell apart when self interest or expediency demanded new combinations; and the countries that were to-day leagued together, to-morrow sought new allies to conquer and destroy their friends of yesterday. The policy of the government as regards naval defence foreshadowed in His Excellency's