

RY OF
ERLWOOD ST.
PTIST CH.

Street Baptist Church
in connection with the
ry celebration. J. S.
very interesting account
of the church. He said
history of this church
lth 1842, when it first
took place in an upper
th St. by Rev. Samuel
wn as the Vinegar Hill
th fifteen charter mem-
47 a need of a house of
which to worship was
and a building was
site and opened for
on Nov. 25th, 1847."

School Organized.
th, 1848, a Sabbath
gnalized with a few
a small library. About
J. Noble became our
nd remained with us
s.

Leod was ordained in
d became its next pas-
r.
number of our members
re organized into a
ev. E. McLeod and G.
his also drew a large
church.
we have
members. The following
licensed to preach:
d. J. N. Barnes, H.
J. House, R. W. Ferguson
ive. Only about three
tive in the ministry at

ve Pastors.
we have had are: Rev.
McLeod, G. A. Hart-
Wm. Downie, Jacob
Parsons, J. W. Clarke,
A. J. Prosser and Gid-

asons of which men-
ere Isaac Vanwart and
e.
onus dot. He made
n loan of \$300,000.

speaker also had re-
length to the great
ing \$10,000 of the pro-
ing it into the re-
ing the principle
(McLeod) agreed that
ould be reduced. Yet
that Government and
the Government had
took this \$10,000 from
it remained for the
stration by the bill
Send a resolution to
EXCEEDING BAD
MEN WHO NEVER
TO REDUCE THESE
that they would
they money themselves.

Charge Made.
ing made by the
e Opposition not one
ad been made against
nt. Certain nasty
and from the
osition in the
entle him to vary
tion. He had watch-
the Surveyor
his own money
ounded them home to
ment in spite of the
continue to handle
a secret
people would take, with
criticisms from men
had the opportunity,
and public services. These
to be regenerated and
re they could be safe-
ness. The fees was an
here would have
generation that knew
ots of Egypt before
hope to enjoy again
consequent trouble. This
one difficulty that
comes when you settle
down upon a fixed annual
money contribution. There
is another
difficulty and it is this—
someone says
It smacks too much of
tribute; we are a free
country and we do not
want to be paying a con-
tribution to the old
country for this or any
other stock in that
argument. Not one atom
of our autonomy, not one
atom of our independence,
not one atom of our power
as a legislature is taken
away from us by the
money we decide and by
vote to place
a certain sum of money
into the hands
of the British government
or the British
admiralty to be applied
to the use of the
empire's defence.
It is not demanded of
us; there is no
tribute unless there is
force and unless
there is a specific demand
which brings
the tribute. A fixed sum
may be a willing gift
of the most liberty loving
and the greatest liberty
enjoying legisla-
ture in the world.

But one says: "We pay, but we do not consider that it is true; but what are we paying for? We are paying for a portion of the defence of the Empire, including ourselves. If we believe that the British government and the British admiralty have the widest experience, the greatest knowledge, the plans of war more thorough, the expert skill, every appliance and every accompaniment of the effective use of the money which we give,

Does it Matter After All?
so very much whether we follow
the course of the expenditure of that money
or not? So that do not take too
great stock in that objection.
Another objection put forth is that
it impinges on our autonomy. I have
dealt with that in a few brief sentences.
To me it does not seem that a free
contribution interferes in the least with
our autonomy, with our own full and
free legislative liberty as well as every
other kind of liberty which we possess.
Another objection that is made is
that Britain may use our contribution
in unjustifiable wars, and that we should
guard ourselves carefully lest we make
a contribution for the equipment and
strengthening of a fleet which may be
used in wars that we do not approve
of. That might be with some countries
an objection; but if you take the history
of Great Britain for the last fifty
years or more, you may pretty fairly
come to the conclusion that, as she has
not and is not now, so in the future
Great Britain will not be liable to carry
on unjustifiable wars of conquest. She
has more territory than she needs. Her
trouble now is to administer the mighty

WE MUST ACCEPT HER SHARE OF THE BURDEN OF PROTECTION OF HER COAST LINE

Hon. Geo. E. Foster, in Parliament, continued from yesterday:

Like Cain's Mark on the Brow of every Canadian; the degradation of it would eat into the heart of every man until he grew servile and cringing. The price we would have to pay would be continual demand, continual recession, until at last absorption finished this people, covered up its name and blotted out its hope of a national future. Bad enough for us to be grown up on strings of a loving and opulent mother, but when we have grown to manhood it is the opposite of every principle of manhood and independence. We should live in our national home by the grace of the stranger, however good-natured and kind he might be. I put away the Monroe doctrine as absolutely untenable for us. We grow up to national manhood under. So I come to the conclusion, imperatively argued out, I know:

That protection is necessary, absolutely necessary. That we cannot as a people owe our protection to the United States of America, or to any other foreign power; that protection must either be borne by ourselves, or by ourselves in conjunction with Great Britain and in cooperation with the mother country. I think these conclusions are logically deducible from the argument I have already used.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments then to take up the question of How This Protection is to be Given. In the first place I recall the circumstances under which my motion was introduced and what has taken place in the way of the more or less important events since. Recollect that my motion deals simply with a stated, regular, uniform, normal line of proceeding and policy. Let us argue out from first, it seems to me that when you boil down all the propositions that are made you get down to two propositions, one or the other of which will be the end to be desired. I desire for a very few moments to canvass these two propositions, not as an advocate who has dogmatically made out his case and wants no objection on the part of one who takes the opposite thought and might wish it, opposite course. But let us, as far as possible, think around them and see what the two mean.

The first is a policy of A Fixed Annual Contribution in Money. to the British government or the British admiralty. Now, that divides itself apparently into two branches, but it is really the same thing. One man says: "Send one million dollars or two million dollars a year;" another man says: "Send a fixed sum of one or two hundred millions," and so far as Canada is concerned these two are absolutely one. We are not in a position to build and equip and send over Dreadnoughts. We are to translate our contribution into Dreadnoughts it comes down in the end to money which would be sufficient to build and equip a Dreadnought and therefore I say we would get down in the end to the one proposition, of an annual fixed contribution of money to the British government for the purpose of national and imperial defence; or if you would rather have it for the purpose of Canada's defence through imperial co-operation and imperial management. The first difficulty in that is: How will you fix the amount of the contribution? The very moment that you sit down in council and say: Let us talk the matter over and fix the proportion that Canada ought to give, you come upon a pretty difficult question. The British taxpayer pays \$2.00 per head and that translated in equal proportions to the Canadian taxpayer would mean an amount of money which would be something like—

What Be Somewhat Appalling. Then, again, how long shall the fixed sum which you fixed to-day remain the proper sum, and will it be subject to constant revision, constant negotiation, and may be occasional aggression? The other objection that comes when you settle down upon a proposition of a fixed annual money contribution, there is another difficulty and it is this—someone says: It smacks too much of tribute; we are a free country and we do not want to be paying a contribution to the old country for this or any other stock in that argument. Not one atom of our autonomy, not one atom of our independence, not one atom of our power as a legislature is taken away from us by the money we decide and by vote to place a certain sum of money into the hands of the British government or the British admiralty to be applied to the use of the empire's defence. It is not demanded of us; there is no tribute unless there is force and unless there is a specific demand which brings the tribute. A fixed sum may be a willing gift of the most liberty loving and the greatest liberty enjoying legislature in the world.

But one says: "We pay, but we do not consider that it is true; but what are we paying for? We are paying for a portion of the defence of the Empire, including ourselves. If we believe that the British government and the British admiralty have the widest experience, the greatest knowledge, the plans of war more thorough, the expert skill, every appliance and every accompaniment of the effective use of the money which we give,

Does it Matter After All?
so very much whether we follow
the course of the expenditure of that money
or not? So that do not take too
great stock in that objection.
Another objection put forth is that
it impinges on our autonomy. I have
dealt with that in a few brief sentences.
To me it does not seem that a free
contribution interferes in the least with
our autonomy, with our own full and
free legislative liberty as well as every
other kind of liberty which we possess.
Another objection that is made is
that Britain may use our contribution
in unjustifiable wars, and that we should
guard ourselves carefully lest we make
a contribution for the equipment and
strengthening of a fleet which may be
used in wars that we do not approve
of. That might be with some countries
an objection; but if you take the history
of Great Britain for the last fifty
years or more, you may pretty fairly
come to the conclusion that, as she has
not and is not now, so in the future
Great Britain will not be liable to carry
on unjustifiable wars of conquest. She
has more territory than she needs. Her
trouble now is to administer the mighty

territory which she has. Her business now is to

Defend the Borders, already if anything too far enlarged, of her territory. The whole spirit of the old country and its motto for the half century, may make us pretty sure that wars of conquest, undertaken for aggressive purposes and for mere lust of battle, are not likely to take place on the Great Britain's coast line.

While these objections have some force, though as I think not a force that is irresistible, there are some reasons which appear to me to have deeper force with reference to that method of taking our part in defence. I do not know whether I can make myself understood to the members of this House on this point, but I shall briefly try to do so.

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring someone else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lousy health and strength, should pay his neighbor something per month for looking after his house and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to that form of aid. It goes over to that year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself

There Will Be No Roots Struck, there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product, yet some time or other, as true as we live to be a people with a population constantly increasing, we must actually have else to this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood, which takes root and grows and develops until it is the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in its glories, its duties and its accomplishments which is after all the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea, in the way of defence and of the maintenance of the rights of the country.

Again, it disjoins What Has Been Joined together from the earliest days of the world's existence—commerce and the protection of commerce. After all, the basic idea of a naval force is the protection of the commerce of a country. A commerce side by side with its protector, and its protector side by side with the commerce of a country, go hand in hand together, and are the best helpers to each other. That is the idea which is in my mind—that when we make our contribution in the way of a fixed sum and it goes from us, and we are not responsible for it, we have none of the inspiring of a growth and development and a laying of a basis for the future defence in our own country. We are deprived of the larger benefit ourselves, and in the future we do no greater service to the empire of which we form a part, in this matter of defence.

Then, again, I think that method ignores the necessities and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become. We must have beginning; these must be small; but some time, or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country, if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom

to be an auxiliary in the case of an outbreak of actual hostilities, which would be, in time of war, sufficient to watch the coast and to share the burden of the defence of a heritage which is ours?

For what have we had from Great Britain in the way of help, we are proud of it and we boast of it, it has been conserved and held against all comers by Great Britain. Go back over a few centuries, watch the wars with the Indians, the first struggles in 1870 and 1812, with the American Republic, take out your pen and ink and draw the map of the continent that Great Britain expended during all that long series of years in order that this heritage might be free to those who would not know it, the wonder of things about it, which stir our hearts and which calls for our concurrent action or gratitude, is that after all that expenditure of treasure and of blood, she handed it over to the Canadian people.

Without Encumbrance of Any Kind—no mortgage upon it, no balance to be paid, the patient British taxpayer footed it all and gave it to the colony that he loved and to the people for whom he had prepared the way. She has guaranteed by her army and navy our security. Our eastern gateway stands open, our western gateway stands open, our northern gateway stands open, and the waters that lie between—Watch the consumption of coal and iron and of lime stone and all building material. Look at our ports and harbors, dotting every portion of our coast line, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Pacific, and a large number of them unusable to a degree. Look at the 40,000 or 60,000 fishermen on the coasts of our river and great lakes, who are placed in the sight of, and largely upon, the water, making themselves fit candidates for the career of commerce and all that pertains to it in the development and progress of a country.

Look at What Nature Has Given Us. View the immense ocean on our shores from east to west and the waters that lie between—Watch the consumption of coal and iron and of lime stone and all building material. Look at our ports and harbors, dotting every portion of our coast line, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Pacific, and a large number of them unusable to a degree. Look at the 40,000 or 60,000 fishermen on the coasts of our river and great lakes, who are placed in the sight of, and largely upon, the water, making themselves fit candidates for the career of commerce and all that pertains to it in the development and progress of a country.

Look at What Nature Has Given Us. View the immense ocean on our shores from east to west and the waters that lie between—Watch the consumption of coal and iron and of lime stone and all building material. Look at our ports and harbors, dotting every portion of our coast line, from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Pacific, and a large number of them unusable to a degree. Look at the 40,000 or 60,000 fishermen on the coasts of our river and great lakes, who are placed in the sight of, and largely upon, the water, making themselves fit candidates for the career of commerce and all that pertains to it in the development and progress of a country.

Great Britain Paid All the Bills, and rendered no bill to us. In the Kiel rebellion our volunteers and our resources were sufficient to quiet the rising; but just outside the ring stood the Canadian people. When Cleveland's message went out in that year, it was Britain's prestige and power which robbed it of its sting, and which made us feel that we were not to be interfered with if any one had come to help against the nationality and the integrity of this country. Our rights have been upheld, our rights of fishery and of navigation in the Atlantic and on the Pacific. When the threat was made that if Britain and Canadian vessels were found within the prescribed area of the North Atlantic, they would be seized and the rights we had in them destroyed, it was the might of Britain which prevented that being done and which saved the wealth of Canada and the Canadian people. When Cleveland's message went out in that year, it was Britain's prestige and power which robbed it of its sting, and which made us feel that we were not to be interfered with if any one had come to help against the nationality and the integrity of this country.

They Mow Have Eternal Life, if they will see for it in the right direction; and the old blood that has been in the veins of the old country is reinvigorated in the overseas possessions and the young blood of life and development and enterprise flows back upon the heart of the empire. We must have beginning; these must be small; but some time, or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country, if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom

To Tow the Seed at Once and cultivate its growth, as best we may, in our circumstances and with our resources, until at last we arrive at that stage of expansion which we have reached in other great lines of our country's progress. You will notice that while I have tried to discuss the pros and cons of this method, while I have stated reasons in favor of it and others against it, my own mind tends rather towards the employment of a fleet of our own, and to an out money contribution.

The second policy to which I would refer is the assuming by ourselves of the defence of our own ports and coasts, and the constant and free co-operation with the imperial force of the mother country. Let us see what are the objections to and what may be urged in support of this method of policy. It has its advocates and its opponents. In the first place we begin with no plant, no expert skill, no trained cadets, no trained sailors.

Canada is a Blank Sheet. Whatever may be necessary has to be collected and assembled together and developed with such expedition and in such abundance as circumstances will allow. Under that system, the best of the world's torpedoes and coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned in a greater. It is said it would be ineffective. Ineffective how? As the last line of defence. Certainly it would. If the whole fleet of the world's navies were to be sent to the coast defence that any of the colonies would have could make no headway against the combined fleets of the world's navies. But we do not believe that that disaster would occur, and we do not believe it because we believe that the provision and the provision will be made sufficient to equip and manned