

to advocate measures that I do not find quite satisfactory. You will, therefore, gather from what I have said that I do not think that either of the two great political parties in Canada exactly realize how they can most effectively assist Great Britain in the present emergency.

That there is an emergency, I make no doubt. No one has yet proved that there is not an emergency. The very fact that the Asquith government brought in a budget imposing extra taxes to meet an emergency, that they required so much more money, and that the budget was so unpopular, that the Asquith government was nearly defeated, shows that there is an emergency. Since that election was over they have ordered the building of four extra Dreadnoughts, showing that in Great Britain at least an emergency is believed to exist. Actions speak louder than words. Now, an emergency requires emergency measures, and these are generally of a temporary character. Therefore, it seems to me that all we have to do at present is to make some temporary arrangement that will enable Britain and the empire to tide over the present crisis. Now, in the old days when a great general met with a military emergency in the shape of a great river that impeded the onward march of his army, he did not stop to build a stone bridge with solid stone abutments, and erect thereon a steel structure; if he had done so, he and his army would have been taken at a great disadvantage, and would have been ruined. Instead of that, he built a bridge of boats over which he safely transferred his army. Similarly, by adopting the principle of a temporary arrangement, I am prepared to show how Canada can give to Britain seven extra Dreadnoughts until this crisis is over. Now, Sir, you may say that is a strong assertion, but I will ask you not to condemn it until you have heard my argument. Besides that, I think I can show you how we can save millions and millions of dollars at the same time to the Canadian people without spending nearly as much money as either of the proposed plans would entail, simply because it will be a temporary measure. Now, if I undertake to prove that big proposition, it will be necessary for me to examine thoroughly the ground and establish my arguments on a solid foundation, because there is no doubt that I will have the whole House against me.

In the first place, I will take up the question of dry-docks. I am in favour of the enlargement of our dry-docks, and I think the government in that respect are going in the right direction. It is absolutely necessary that we should enlarge our dry-docks. Our trade and commerce require it. Take the dry-dock at Lévis, Quebec, only 600 feet long and 62 feet wide. Suppose the 'Oceanic' wished to come to that

port, she is 635 feet long and 68 feet wide, and if any accident should happen to that vessel in the Gulf of St. Lawrence she could not be repaired on this side of the water, she would have to cross the ocean before she could be repaired. Now, we know that a vessel, when injured, generally draws more water than she did before. Therefore, I say that the dry-dock at Lévis should be enlarged. We have many other vessels plying to Quebec which the dry-dock is too small to accommodate. We have sailing the ocean such ships as the 'Kaiser William II.,' the 'Deutschland,' the 'Cedric,' and the 'Baltic,' the great size of which renders it necessary that dry-docks must be made larger and larger. Why, not so long ago, the 'Empress of Ireland' had to be taken across the ocean to be repaired. I say, Sir, that the requirements of our trade and commerce demand that these dry-docks should be enlarged. If we are to compete with an enlarged, and deepened, and improved, Erie canal, we must do everything in our power to keep up the good name of the St. Lawrence route, and to provide that insurance rates on that route shall be reduced. For my part, I would approve of the dry-dock at Halifax being enlarged, and I may say here that I am in favour of the establishment of a naval college in Halifax, or anywhere else, where it may best be located. I believe also that the dry-docks at St. John and Esquimalt should be enlarged. But, Sir, I object entirely to saying that such improvements are to be charged up to the motherland as something we have done for her or on her behalf. Why, to say that, would be acting on the principle that if a man had a fine residence in this city with beautiful grounds, and some tramp was to attack him in his garden, and a neighbour came across to assist him, and after the melee it was necessary to take that neighbour into his house, get a surgeon and have his wounds attended to, and then when he would be going away, instead of the man thanking him for coming to his assistance he would say: I built this big house and fixed up these grounds for your special accommodation and benefit. In a similar way, if a war vessel of Britain is ever injured in Canadian waters, it will be when she comes here to protect the cowardly Canadians who will not defend themselves, and surely we might give these British ships the benefit of our dry-docks until they get their wounds repaired.

There is another matter which I think should be taken up by the government, and that is the encouragement of aviation. I think this government should have done something for Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin, when they attended the military camp at Petawawa last summer. We are told that the government gave them the use of some sheds on the grounds, but what the gov-

Mr. T. CHISHOLM.