

As to the character and the amount of the contribution in both parliaments. It would not be permanent or continuous.

But last of all—and I want you gentlemen who sit behind you leader to follow this—this is what he said on January 12, as to the effect of a contribution:

It would conduce to severing the present connection between Canada and the empire.

Of course, my hon. friend may have been simply talking without any deliberation, without any responsibility. I assume the leader of the opposition has the right to talk without responsibility sometimes. I do not know whether he was here talking to his Quebec wing when he proposed to give a contribution with the idea that it is going to tend to sever our connection with the empire; perhaps it was to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who said just before concluding his speech that there was something in the resolution of the leader of the opposition with which he agreed, perhaps it was that part of it.

Mr. MONK. I would ask my hon. friend where he finds in any utterance of mine or of anybody on this side of the House a desire or an intent to sever the connection with the British empire? Where does he find it, and if he does not find it anywhere, what right has he to insinuate here?

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience I will give him evidence in a few minutes as to statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) which will satisfy him that the hon. member for North Toronto regards him as a gentleman who would like to do that. I do not propose to call the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as a witness on the question of contribution, I do not have to; I think the leader of the opposition has proved my case. But as we hear a great deal about Australia, about the virtue of contribution and all that, let me call attention to what Mr. Deakin, the premier of Australia, says about contribution. Speaking at Melbourne in 1902, he said:

The policy of centralization restricted the colonies to contributions in coin while the policy of decentralization would substitute trained men and basis of supply with place of subsidies. Australia strongly favoured the decentralization advocated by Sir Edward Barton as contrasted with the centralization sought by the proposals of Mr. Broderick and the admiralty which in no way appealed to the patriotic sentiment and self-reliant spirit of Australians. No colonial force under war office control could have furnished such effective soldiers for South Africa as the volunteer contingents had furnished to show loyalty to the empire, let us send money; the Liberal party says: Let us train up men interested in the defence of Canada who will

stand by Canada and the empire both in peace and war.

But what does the Sydney 'Bulletin,' that influential Australian paper say:

From what ever point of view—imperial or anti-imperial—the scheme is considered, its only logical defence lies in the theory that Australia is a poor, forsaken country.

They are speaking of the Australian agreement of 1902.

Without administrative brains, courage, enterprise or intelligence, not fit to have any dignified part in its own naval defence, not to be trusted with any weapons lest it should misuse them, worthy only to drudge for the money which a higher and more capable power shall spend.

All of which is true about my hon. friend's position to-day.

And to provide the loblolly boys the slushes, and the deck swabbers, whose efforts a higher power shall direct and control.

A splendid policy for young Canadians, is it not?

The alternative to the naval tribute, proposed by Mr. Barton, is the expenditure of a like sum of money, or if necessary a much larger sum of money, on an Australian navy, which would be organized on the same lines as the Australian army, and would probably be, for some time at least, commanded by a British admiral, and to a very considerable extent officered by Britishers.

This navy would, in times of peace, be used as a training squadron for Australian naval men. In times of war it would be available for the defence of Australia, and there is no doubt, for the assistance of Britain in other waters, if that were called for.

That is what Australia thinks about contributions. I need not go over in detail the points in which that which Australia is doing differs from what is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is enough to say that Australia is providing a navy for the defence of its own coasts, and New Zealand is making it a condition—an absolute condition—that the ship which she is providing shall be stationed at New Zealand and shall be for the protection of New Zealand; and the money she gives is not given to the admiralty but is given solely and only for the purpose of paying extra wages to the New Zealand men who go into that establishment. And yet these hon. gentlemen want to give \$25,000,000 not for anything that is going to come back to Canada, not for anything that will guard our coasts or that will contribute to our own progress and advancement, but simply to throw it away without restriction or condition.

But my hon. friend says that a great panic is on, that the power of Great Britain is menaced, and all that kind of thing, and therefore we must send this money. Why, this story of naval panic is an old