

speeches of two of them. I will first read from the speech of Mr. Borden, who is now leader of the government. On that day he said:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a naval force of our own.

I like that Canadian pride.

The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the Mother Country, and it has not worked satisfactorily in any respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory; in Australia, it failed in the end, to meet with the approval of the people.

So I am at one with the Prime Minister in so far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also that I think an expenditure of money designed for that purpose ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own parliament; and that by making an appropriation of that kind, and attending to the defence, and to co-ordination with the Imperial navy forces, we would be rendering a real service to the defence of the empire, and we would be doing our duty not only to Canada, but to the empire as a whole.

What suggestions I have to make with the sincere desire that we may shape a resolution of which we can all approve and which shall go forth to the world as a ringing declaration that if the mother of nations has to fight the battle of her life, the people of Canada without distinction of party or of creed will stand beside her in that fight. This is too great a question for the introduction of party strategy. It is a question in respect to which we should all rise superior to party motives, and so I propose making to my right hon. friend one or two suggestions which I know he will receive in the spirit in which I make them.

That is a noble speech. It dates four years ago. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman shares these views still, although not expressed quite in that form. Another quotation a year later nearly, January 12, 1910, he said:

It has been suggested that instead of the organization of a Canadian naval force there should be a system of annual contributions from this country to the mother country; and I am free to admit that, from the strategic point of view I would be inclined to agree with the view of the admiralty that this would be the best way for the great self-governing dominions of the empire to make their contributions. But, Sir, from a constitutional and political standpoint I am opposed to it, for many reasons. In the first place I do not believe that it would endure. In the second place it would be a source of friction. It would become a bone of partisan contention.

I am afraid it has got there now.

It would be subject to criticism as to the character and the amount of the contributions in both parliaments. It would not be permanent or continuous. It would conduce, if anything, to severing the present connection between Canada and the empire.

These are terrible consequences associated a little more than three years ago with annual contribution.

Permanent co-operation in defence, in my opinion, can only be accomplished by the use of our own material, the employment of our own people, the development and utilization of our own skill and resourcefulness, and above all by impressing upon the people a sense of responsibility for their share in international affairs.

Mr. Foster's Views.

Now for the third of these noble Romans, speaking of a contribution he said:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and