

true, as he says, that there are great opportunities in front of Canada for the development of the steel and iron industries and of ship building. As far as I have been able to learn, during this debate, there has never been an expression of opinion from a member on this side of the House against the establishment of steel industries or of ship-building in this country. There has never been an expression of opinion from any hon. member on this side of the House to the effect that the Canadian people were incapable of building ships. These words have been put into the mouths of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and that impression has been sought to be conveyed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have never maintained anything of the kind. We maintain that this \$35,000,000, which is being granted for the specific purpose of building three dreadnoughts, could be expended better and more to the advantage of Canada and the Empire by having these ships built in the Old Country. Many hon. members on the other side of the House have expressed themselves as being in agreement with that view. While the debate was in progress I put the question to several hon. gentlemen: Suppose you went on with the building of two fleet units, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific—these fleet units would have to be headed each by a dreadnought—where will you have these dreadnoughts built? All the hon. members to whom that question was addressed expressed themselves as to being favourable to having these dreadnoughts built in England. Would it not be an unreasonable thing for the Dominion of Canada to undertake to establish shipyards here for the building of dreadnoughts? I am only speaking of dreadnoughts and not of the smaller class of war vessels. It would seem to me to be an unbusinesslike proposition for the people of Canada to invest a large sum of money in a plant for the building of dreadnoughts unless they intend to continue in the dreadnought building business. I do not think there are many hon. gentlemen on either side of the House who would take the position that Canada would be prepared to go into the dreadnought building business. Would it be wise or businesslike for us to establish an expensive plant to build two or three dreadnoughts? It would be a very foolish thing to do.

As regards the building of smaller vessels, that is an entirely different proposition. While hon. gentlemen speak with regard to ship-building and our shipping interests in this country, what have they done, what did they do during the time they were in power, to develop the ship-building industry? Is it not a fact that many of the Government vessels engaged in dredging and other Government work

Mr. EDWARDS.

were purchased by the Laurier Government outside of Canada? Why were these vessels not built in Canada? Why did the former Government, if they were so full of the idea of encouraging ship-building in this country, not make a start and build two vessels instead of going to the Old Country and buying the Rainbow and the Niobe?

The hon. member for Cape Breton South speaks in regard to our lumber, iron and all that sort of thing and he says that we are throwing them to the dogs, or to the wolves. Mr. Chairman, I could understand that statement if hon. gentlemen were in power. I dare say that when the hon. member for Cape Breton South made use of those words, there flashed through the mind of the hon. member sitting in front of him (Mr. Pugsley) some idea of sawdust wharves and all that sort of thing when the money was thrown—I do not know whether you call it to the dogs or to the wolves. But at all events a great deal of it went in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a very important matter to introduce into a discussion of the naval question.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, of all men on the face of this globe, I will not say in this Parliament, but of all men from the Atlantic to the Pacific in Canada, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) is the last man who should charge anyone with using language not relevant to the matter under discussion. The energy and predominant ability along certain lines of the hon. member for St. John would be in great demand in England at the present moment in the suffragette ranks; he is a star in that line.

Now, in regard to the question as to what constitutes an emergency. Hon. gentlemen opposite assert very positively that there is no emergency and that all thought of an emergency has vanished. To hear hon. gentlemen opposite one would think that all they have to do is to make the statement that there is no emergency and that settles it. In their minds, what constitutes an emergency is apparently some immediate peril, something that will take place within a week, or a struggle which is actually being engaged in. If war was actually going on, I suppose they would call that an emergency; but because war has not been declared there is in their eyes no emergency. It appears to me that when one considers that Great Britain has found it necessary to withdraw her vessels from many seas and concentrate them in home waters, that is an indication of an emergency; it is an indication that in the minds of British statesmen there is necessity for strengthening the position in home waters. That in my view constitutes an