

ance, including upkeep of hulls, machinery, sea stores, fuel, interest and depreciation is estimated at \$4,253,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand my right hon. friend clearly. Do I understand him to say that it will take one year to construct a plant which will be sufficient to build this fleet, and then four years to complete the vessels?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister gives that to the House, of course, as sufficiently certain, to base the judgment of the House upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we really want.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would be difficult to give more than an approximate idea upon that until we know exactly the proposition made to us. Then we can speak accurately. I give these figures as the result of the best inquiry I can make, no more.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the authority upon whom my right hon. friend depends?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give that to my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. We might get into the same difficulty we did in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. We want to avoid that, if possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is no doubt a laudable object; but I am sure that my hon. friend himself would not regret the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific even if it cost more than it has, and I think perhaps it will be the same with the navy.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have my right hon. friend take silence as consent. I am altogether opposed to that view. Can he tell what the plant which would be suitable to construct these vessels would probably cost?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not able to give my hon. friend more information than I am giving to-day. I am discussing this matter from a general point of view. When we come to the committee stage, I will endeavour to satisfy his curiosity as to these details.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? The interpretation clause of the Bill says that 'emergency means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.' If it requires one year to construct the plant and four years to construct the navy, what would he

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

do if such an emergency arose in the meantime?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are getting pretty far from the question we have in hand just now.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? It is simply this: does that plant include machinery for the manufacture of guns and machinery?—because seventy per cent of the cost of these ships consists of guns and machinery.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think ships and guns are different things. But I am only at present giving a general outline of the policy; I do not think the details are a part of the present discussion on the second reading of the Bill; they can all be asked for in Committee of the House. I may say that it is the intention of the government to establish a new department for this service—not under a different minister, but to have a deputy minister charged with the duty of looking after this naval expenditure and this naval construction. On this point I will give further explanations when we are in committee.

There is one other observation I should make. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the course of his observations the other day, if I understood him aright, whilst approving of the principle of this measure, thought it did not go far enough, but that we should also make an emergency contribution on account of the apprehended danger to Great Britain from Germany. I do not know whether I have apprehended rightly the position taken by my hon. friend on this point. I think I did. At all events, if he did not take this position, it has been taken very generally by the press of the country speaking for the other side of the House. For my part, I do not see any cause of danger to Great Britain at the present time. Let me say further that if Great Britain were engaged in such a contest, a wave of enthusiasm to assist her would sweep over this country and all other British countries. It is true, Germany is creating a navy, but I see no reason whatever for supposing that Germany is creating a navy for the purpose of attack or that England is increasing her navy for the purpose of attacking Germany. The fact is that all the nations of Europe at the present time are arming: England is arming, Germany is arming, France is arming, Austria is arming; but I do not believe any of these nations is arming with any intention of attacking its neighbour, but all are arming simply because they are afraid that they will be attacked by one of their neighbours. I was impressed by one statement of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, though I do not share in the conclusions which he implied from it. He said that if war came between England and