

it can be produced anywhere else in the civilized world.

In establishing and developing such enterprises we will at the same time be making Canada, in the matter of appliances and armaments of war, a base of supplies on this North American continent, which in time of war on either the Atlantic or Pacific would be of incalculable value to the whole empire.

These are the words of Mr. Drummond, who, if I mistake not, is an enthusiastic supporter of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) speaking in Montreal in the Chambers of Commerce of the empire, in 1903. And he quoted in support of his views Sir John C. R. Colomb, the distinguished naval authority. Well, Sir John C. R. Colomb, on the occasion to which I refer, said:

The truth is our present policy of centralizing the manufacture and supply of appliances and munitions of war to meet not merely naval but military requirements of a world state, is wholly indefensible and fraught with peril.

And what was the resolution adopted? Some of the gentlemen there desired to pass a resolution in favour of contribution, but the collective wisdom of the business world of the empire discarded the contribution theory, and all concurred in the following, which was moved by Col. Denison of Toronto and seconded by Mr. Masson of Montreal—both, I believe, political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite:

The word 'contribute' was struck out.

That this Congress hereby affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the empire—but the colonies claim the privilege of keeping their own initiative as to the nature and help which they agree to offer.

That was the policy agreed upon by the Chambers of Commerce of the empire in 1903. Is not that a proper and sound policy?

What was the next step? In 1907, the conference took place. Now, one would think to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk that the official wisdom of the admiralty was all directed in the line of telling Canada: If you do not send a contribution, do not send anything. What is the good, they ask, of providing a 'tin-pot navy'?—money is what we must send—tribute. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) revolts at the tribute idea, but what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) wants to give is tribute. And that is what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wants to give—tribute. But that does not appear to be the policy of the British naval authorities. This is what Lord Tweedmouth said in 1907:

He states that he did not desire to press for further contributions of men or money but cordially welcomed the co-operation of the

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

colonies in the form most agreeable to themselves.

To-day, when my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) quibbles and twists and worries his soul in order to try to get himself into an attitude of opposition to the government measure, he tries to convey the impression that the policy of the government is not in accordance with the resolutions of 1907. And the last word of Lord Tweedmouth on the subject was as follows:

It was entirely a matter for the colonies how far they would assist by subsidy and how far by local defence, and that what His Majesty's government desired was the cordial help of the colonies in the most effective manner and in the form most acceptable to the several dominions beyond the seas.

There is no intimation there that a contribution of money was the only thing the British government wanted or that the people of Great Britain thought the colonies ought to give. On the contrary, the colonies were left absolutely free to do as they pleased, having regard to their different conditions.

My hon. friend, last year, in an eloquent speech cordially supported the resolution which was, let me say, the mandate which my hon. friends the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) took with them when they went to England. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) talked the other night about these representatives of ours refusing to offer a fleet unit in the Pacific and about their failing to do this, that and the other. But these representatives of Canada were there with strict instructions—absolute, fast instructions. The first instruction which they had to convey to the home authorities was one given by my hon. friends opposite—that the first thing they should argue for and the last thing they should say was that Canada was going to provide her own navy and that Canada would not give contributions because they were bad things. It was the unanimous resolution of this House that Canada should provide her own navy. What, then, could these gentlemen do? They could simply ask the imperial authorities to indicate how best a Canadian navy could be provided that would work in sympathy with the imperial authorities.

There have been occasions when a charge of lack of consistency would necessarily have very little force. For instance, in the old days, in regard to Gladstone, who entered parliament as a Conservative and came to the end of his journey as probably one of the greatest Radicals of his time, a charge of inconsistency would have been out of place. But when a public man performs somersaults of opinion; when a public man who is supposed to have a sense of responsibility deliberately stands before