

to make up my mind as to where he was in earnest and where he was jolly.

Mr. GRAHAM: A good deal like my Hon. friend to-day.

Mr. FOSTER: Some of his most earnest words were accompanied by such a quizzical look that I came to the conclusion it was not necessary to follow them out as part of a serious argument.

MENACES THE CONSTITUTION AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

One of his assertions was that our policy would reverse the constitutional relations between us and the Old Country and put them 70 years backward.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER: He says that Downing Street would expend our money that the Admiralty would purchase our ships. He says: You tell young Canada to Stand back, you shall not build ships; you shall not man them, you shall not equip them—stand back, this money is to be sent to the old land and they are to do it there. He says it interferes with responsible government. Now was he serious in making that statement?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, decidedly so.

Mr. FOSTER: Did he really fear that if this Bill went through and the money were expended as the Bill directs, responsible government and constitutional relations would be reversed and put back 70 or 50 years? I advise my good friend to be cautious in his answer because he will be judged by it. Was he really fearful of that or was it merely a stalking horse for the elections? If it was not a stalking horse what about the proposal of his Right Hon. leader to send \$140,000,000 over to Downing Street? Let us argue it out. If a \$35,000,000 gift will put back constitutional relations 70 years, four times that gift will put it back 280 years.