

speeches from the leaders of both sides, and the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House of Commons expressed himself as follows on the resolution:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country 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 Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. 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 for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas; and when the operation of that squadron was so extended, the Australians felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which her interests demanded. So that the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of sub-marines and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British Navy. It was pointed out in discussing this question that Australia in providing a force of that kind would provide a force which it would be very difficult if not impossible for Great Britain to send across the seas and that in thus protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the empire. So I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also that I think that 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 co-ordination with the Imperial Navy forces, we would be rendering a real service in the defence of the empire and we would be doing our duty not only to Canada but to the empire as a whole.

Now the hon. gentlemen opposite may have noticed that in that resolution there was an expression which called for immediate action. When I look up the debate which took place on that resolution I find that it was the present leader of the government, the right hon. Mr. Borden, who suggested that the word 'speedy' be included in that resolution. I read from page 3521 of the Debates of 1909:

I would be glad if my right hon. friend could accept the suggestion of inserting in that paragraph some word which would in-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

dicating an intention to act promptly. If my hon. friend would insert before the word 'organization' some such word as 'immediate' or even 'early,' I think it would greatly improve the paragraph, it would meet with my approval, and I do not think it would be disapproved of by any hon. member of this House.

And in the following year when the leader of the present government came back from Europe, in a speech in Toronto he mentioned the part he had taken in the drafting of that resolution, and he indicated that the word 'speedy' was introduced at his suggestion as well as the last part of the resolution. If we had gone to the country after that resolution was passed by the House of Commons is it not apparent that we would have met with a unanimous response from the whole of Canada? What mandate has the present government received from the people of Canada? If any mandate has been given is it based on this resolution which was unanimously passed by the House of Commons. Unfortunately I am obliged to answer in the negative. Something happened in 1910 which disturbed the harmony existing in the country over this resolution passed the year before, a by-election in the province of Quebec in Drummond and Arthabaska, which was carried by the Nationalists. When we met again in November, 1910, we found that the present leader of the government felt that he had to trim somewhat his sails to catch the votes of the province of Quebec, or a certain number of them, and there was a 'rapprochement' of those two wings of the present coalition government which appeared on the vote given on two amendments moved to the speech from the Throne in the session of 1910-11. One of these was moved by the leader of the opposition at that time, now the Premier, and it called for a plebiscite on the permanent policy of the government and for an emergency contribution. The second amendment was by Mr. Monk and it asked that no naval policy should be adopted without a plebiscite. We found the Conservative party, led by the present leader of the government, joining hands with Mr. Monk and voting for that motion which called for a plebiscite. The House was dissolved on another question, one that dominated all the others and