

nations, and that trade could be hunted by German cruisers, and there is not a Canadian cruiser to fire a shot to prevent them. The Alabama in 1862 played havoc with United States commerce, from which it has not yet recovered. Two ships at that time did it all. It would not require more than two ships to destroy our commerce, yet we have no defence, and that is a difficulty in the Bill which I hope hon. gentlemen will consider.

Defence on Land.

We are providing this year in the Militia Department for an expenditure of \$10,000,000, for the land defence of Canada. So far as Naval defence either of commerce or the coast is concerned there is to this hour not a single dollar promised in the Supply Bill. If it is important to be protected on land, it is equally important to be protected at sea? How can we support a Bill that overlooks entirely such protection? We could at least begin the construction of dockyards and shipyards and such other establishments as might be required for a Canadian Navy as was proposed under the Laurier Act with a view to the final construction of a Canadian Navy, but all this is overlooked as if Canadian home defence was a matter of no consequence. What would you think if an engineer who in constructing a bridge over a river would build a strong abutment at one end and allow the other end of the bridge to rest on the sand? Figuratively we are building a bridge for the defence of the Empire. The British end is strong now and I do not object to increasing its strength, but the Canadian end of the bridge is weak. It has no foundation. Such bridge building could not be defended for one moment, as a sample of good engineering. It is equally indefensible as a sample of Naval defence.

Let me give another illustration. Would it be wise in building an armoured ship to place all the armour on one side? That is practically what we are doing under the Borden Naval policy. The British side of this armoured ship is well plated now and we are adding to its strength, while the Canadian side has not an armour plate to protect its ribs from the first broadside of the enemy. Is that good naval engineering? I think it is not.

My hon. friend said yesterday 'If Canada is to be of assistance to the Empire in naval defence, to deliberately talk of budding a navy : : Canada is an insult to Great Britain.' It is the only observation he made during the whole speech to which I would take very strong exception. I am bound to say that, to my mind, the language is very objectionable—I will not use a stronger word. Can it be possible that it is an insult to Great Britain for us to build a permanent navy? Is it possible that we cannot get the skilled men to do it? Are we less advanced in engineering skill than Japan that only issued fifty years ago from eastern barbarism, or than Australia, or old decrepit Spain, who long ago reached her zenith, or Italy, or Austria-Hungary. Surely my hon. friend does not entertain the idea that to build a Canadian navy would be an insult to Great Britain or anybody else. I have confidence that a country that has the administration of one-third of the extent of the British empire, is able to do anything it chooses to do. As Tennyson says:

We sailed wherever ship can sail,
We founded many a mighty state,
Pray heaven our greatness may not fail,
Through craven fear of being great.