

such as would be required. It would take us years to get the men trained for this work and those necessary appliances.

What good would those cruisers be to Britain if they were lying in the mouth of the St. Lawrence if Britain were engaged in a life and death struggle with German Dreadnoughts in the North Sea? They would be no more use to her than my hitching post standing on the street in front of my office in Wingham would be to me to-day in trying to rouse the government to do their duty and avoid this foolish and extravagant expenditure of public money. If a wounded man were in a position where he could not get away, and saw a man loading a rifle with the avowed intention of attacking him, if he was not just fit for the lunatic asylum, he would not sit down there to manufacture a little wooden pop-gun to defend himself. He might try to borrow, or hire, or buy, some weapon. The government is in a similar position, and is acting just in that way. The German Dreadnoughts are nearly ready to launch, and yet our government are going to sit down to build little Dreadnoughts of their own. I think that settles the government question.

I will now undertake a task which is probably not so agreeable, that is an examination of the resolution that has been brought in by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I must say that I do not approve very much of either, but, after all, the resolution brought in by the leader of the opposition would give Great Britain two extra Dreadnoughts at the right time and in the right place, before 1912 or 1913. It may have a great many other drawbacks, and certainly there are a great many reasons why I do not approve of a gift of money, but at the same time it has that good quality, and I consider in that respect it is a little better than the government plan. I must admit that there was some truth in the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just assumed his seat (Mr. Beauparlant). He referred to the fact that the government were proposing to spend a certain amount of money on war ships, and that there was a proposal that there should be a plebiscite. I think myself there is a great deal of force in that, and if the government are to be blamed for spending \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000—for I have no idea it will be anything less—without consulting the people, certainly there is a little force in the argument that the opposition should not propose to spend \$20,000,000 without consulting the people. I must admit there is some force in that argument. There is another argument. We have not got \$20,000,000 to spend. I notice that there has been a continual reference to \$25,000,000. That sum is not mentioned in the resolution of the leader of the opposition, it only mentions enough to build two Dread-

noughts. The original Dreadnought cost not quite \$10,000,000. Therefore, \$20,000,000 is the amount. We have not \$20,000,000. If we pass a resolution to-day to give to Britain \$20,000,000, or two Dreadnoughts, we have neither dollars nor Dreadnoughts to give. We will have to go to Great Britain to borrow the money, and if we gave the Dreadnoughts, we would have to go to Britain to get them built. We would be like a child going to his father in the Christmas holidays and saying: I want to get \$100 to buy you a new watch, to make you a present. The father to please the child might give the \$100, but he would know he was weakening himself financially, for if he kept the \$100, he could certainly make a better bargain than the little boy.

Another objection to a money payment is that by it we would be paying for protection instead of fighting for our freedom. Canadians are not such cringing cowards that they are afraid to fight. They are ready to fight for the empire but here we are going to give them a few dollars and say: Let us away. That is the part the coward always plays, he does not want to meet the foe but hires a substitute, he gives a little money. In this connection I may say plainly that no nation that has long depended on hired protection has retained its liberty for any length of time. We have an example of this in the old days. At the close of the Persian war, the Athenians and the minor Greek states met together and arranged to raise a fleet for the protection of their common interests. It was arranged that three small states should have fleets of their own and that the others should pay an annual subsidy to Athens and she was to keep a fleet for their protection. This went on for a short time until after a while, some of the smaller states requested that Athens should account for the money she had received. Pericles told them: Oh this is a tribute, you have no right to ask for an accounting. He had command of the fleet they had paid for and they had to continue in subjection. What was the result? These hitherto invincible Greeks remained subjects and were enslaved for nearly 2,000 years, being mastered by the Macedonians and the Romans and the Turks in succession. But we have another example more easily understood by people in this country. After the Romans left Britain, the people of Britain who had been doing no fighting for about 400 years, were unable to protect themselves against the Picts and Scots. They hired the Germans under Hengist and Horsa who came over to assist them and it runs in my mind that the descendants of the Saxons who came there at that time are there yet, they took possession of the country. We have also an example in our own country. When Champlain came to our country the Algon-

Mr. T. CHISHOLM