

to inculcate the lesson which Lord Selbourne desired to teach:

The British empire owes its existence to the sea and it can only continue to exist if all parts of it regard the sea as their natural source of existence and strength. If our brethren beyond the seas will undertake a large share of naval burden, well and good. But I regard it as of even more importance that they should cultivate the maritime spirit.

That is the lesson Lord Selbourne wished to inculcate in speaking of the colonies: Give us whatever contributions you like, in whatever form you like, but go on and develop the maritime spirit and teach your young men how to navigate ships, so that in times of stress and storms, they will be of use, not only to the colonies, but to the British empire. In the olden days when wooden ship-building was in vogue, the English flag was found floating over Canadian bottoms in every sea, officered by sons of Canada, but with the decadence of wooden ships all that has disappeared; and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, coming from the maritime provinces, knows the decadence that has occurred in these provinces in maritime interest and spirit, and he knows, if no one else on the other side does, the force and aptness of Lord Selbourne's advice, that what we want in Canada above all else is to cultivate the maritime spirit. But how much of that spirit are you going to cultivate by sending \$25,000,000 Canadian money to the home government? A splendid way that would be of inculcating maritime spirit in the hearts of our young men who have aspirations for a sea-faring life. We would be practically telling them: We do not want you to sail Canadian vessels, but we want to send our money to be spent in British shipyards among British workmen and British sailors and not a dollar to be spent in Canada among Canadian workmen and Canadian sailors. That is the policy of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

But some hon. gentleman will tell you that this business of building steel ships is one which Canada is utterly unable to deal with. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) last year, who usually has a splendid fund of information on almost every subject, said in this House:

Now, carrying out the idea first involved in naval defence for Canada, I do not see any reasons why we should not immediately institute some system of naval defence along the lines of torpedo boats, or torpedo destroyers, and destroyer cruisers, which would be invaluable to us in case of war.

My hon. friends opposite, who talk about this tin pot navy, had better go and reason with this gentleman from North Simcoe:

A great many members suggest or imply that it would be impossible for us to build these at home. Now I do not wish to be considered local in any way, I have always taken a national or Canadian view of every subject; nevertheless, I may be permitted to say that within the riding which I have the honour to represent there is a shipyard wherein they have launched ships over 500 feet in length, which is said to be the length of the 'Dreadnought.'

Then he went on to say:

Ship-building is a splendid enterprise, an enterprise that gives employment to a great number of men, and it is the greatest national enterprise that a country can have.

That, Sir, is true doctrine and that is what this government wants this country to do:

We should undertake the work of building carriers because the money that is paid to foreign carrier to convey our products from Canada to Great Britain and other countries is a large sum which we should retain in our own country.

Good doctrine; splendid doctrine! I am sorry to see so many of my hon. friends opposite dissent from it, but as the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowkes) has pointed out, they have forgotten every tradition their old chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, taught them. Their motto no longer is: 'Canada for the Canadians,' but it is: Do not spend Canadian money in Canada but spend it in any other place by preference. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) went on to say:

As I pointed out we should immediately assume the position of establishing a local defence of our own. Our local defence should consist of torpedo boats and destroyers, and they would convoy our merchant ships, in case of war, to England and save them from the attacks of cruisers.

I think, said the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) we are all presumed to be at one on that question. Why did every one presume that? If our hon. friends opposite were not at one on that question, if they were not in accord in believing that the time had come for Canada to begin her own navy and build it at home, then all they said was empty vapour. In that case the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was a mere figment of the imagination, it was nothing but sound and fury, it had no particular significance; and as for my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who can argue just as well on the one side as on the other, of course no one holds him responsible.

Why cannot we begin in Canada to build ships? Why, Germany, which these gentlemen hold up as the great menace to British supremacy to-day, only began to build steel ships some twelve years ago. If Ger-