

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS—Evaporated, diminished in size and importance, and by the time we came to the discussion of the Bill in this House, nobody seemed to be afraid. The Government believing that emergency, as no doubt it did, and anxious for the protection of Canada and the Empire, brought in a Bill. Now there is no emergency, of course, or we would have the Bill. But is it sound policy, or is it statesmanship to have a Naval Bill only when there is an emergency? It would take three years to build the ships. Tremendous emergencies may arise within three years. And here the Government is sitting at rest, while the nations of the world are sharpening their swords, and laying the keels of great dreadnoughts from the Atlantic to the North Sea. And because the Senate of Canada rejected their Bill—amended or delayed their Bill rather—they will do nothing. We did not reject the Bill. We did not destroy one feature of it. We delayed it. But the Government is sitting, and letting the nations of Europe prepare against Great Britain. I do not call that statesmanship. Perhaps I do not know what statesmanship is. I would say that if the Empire were in danger last year, it is in danger this year. And I would say that it is always in danger, that no nation of the world is free from the menace of other nations. Did the United States begin to build a navy when there was an emergency? They began it twenty years before, in a period of perfect calm, not a cloud in the sky, not a menace from either side. With the foresight of a great people they said, 'The time may come when it will be necessary to have a navy. We will anticipate the future, and will build ships to protect our coasts and commerce.' They are still building them, and they are pretty nearly in the second rank of first-class nations in sea defences. There was no emergency when they commenced their navy. That was statesmanship. Was there any emergency when Japan began her great system of building battleships? The emergency came years after the keels of many ships for Japan were laid. They were wisely laid. They were anticipating danger, as you have to anticipate in every condition of national life, and when the emergency came they were ready, and Russia felt the shock of that tremendous blow which they administered on the sea of Japan, and the coast of Asia,

Hon. Mr. WATSON.

in their defence of the institutions of their country. That was better statesmanship in Japan—that nation which marched fifty years ago from the ranks of barbarism—than we have in Canada to-day. We should not wait for a menace, or an emergency but we should lay the foundations deep and strong, and the time may come before the ships are built that an emergency may arise. The Government is losing time. They will be held responsible by the people of Canada, and the people of the Empire if an emergency should arise before the ships are gone to war, and before the strong arm of Canada is reached out to help the British Empire. They will be responsible for any injury or evil consequence that may arise, when we have to face the emergency in the North sea, or wherever we have to face it. That is my contention, and I do not think any public man in Canada, or anywhere else, would justify the manner in which the Naval Bill is being disposed of. The Bill is to stand over—I do not know for how long. There is no mention of that. We may begin to build battleships sooner than we expect, but in the meantime it is postponed. I think we should be prepared to face the evil day as soon as possible. When we delayed the last Bill in order that the people might be heard from, we did not delay the building of ships. Why within twenty-four hours of the defeat of the Bill in this House—shall I call it defeat?—the Government could, under the Act of 1910, proceed with the construction of these ships.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Hear, hear, as many as they liked.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS (Middlesex)—They could call for tenders, but they did not. No, and on what grounds? I do not believe in the high mightiness of the Czar of all the Russias or any Czar under a democratic or any form of government. If their motive was that they should not act because they did not get their own way, then it was no motive at all. We said; 'Let it be delayed until we hear from the people.' They could dissolve the House next day, they could hear from the people, and they might hear something that would not be very agreeable. I do not know what they would hear. But they did not want to hear from the people. In six weeks from the defeat of that Bill, the people could be heard from, and if the people said 'Well done good and faithful servants,