

ing a railway from the interior to the Hudson Bay shores, a railway the terminus of which will be at least ten thousand miles from Halifax. We are building a transcontinental railway the terminus of which will be at least ten thousand miles from Esquimaux. Will any one tell me if we can afford to leave these isolated stations without any protection? Sir, whatever may be the verdict or the opinion which in a moment of passion or excitement may be pronounced, in the calmer moments my hon. friends opposite will come to the conclusion that we have to protect these distant shores, either by fortification or by ships. Now, if that work is to be done, if that duty is to be undertaken, it can be undertaken only by one of two parties, either by England or Canada, and our answer is that Canada must do it. That is my answer to the motion moved by my hon. friend Mr. Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the motion moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Let us go still further and let us take up the discussion, but in the very beginning of the matter, which we have now before us, let us not look at the facts, but, if possible, let us argue the question without any prejudices. Let us take the fact of the duty which we owe to ourselves as a nation and which we owe to Great Britain as a part of the British Empire. A school has lately arisen in Great Britain which has lately arisen in this country, the object of which has been to draw the young nations of the empire, Canada in particular, into the armaments of England, into the stream of militarism in which England is engaged as one of the great powers of Europe. We have always, on this side of the House, fought against that idea. We have always maintained that the conditions of England and the conditions of Canada are so different that at this time it cannot be thought of at all events. I do not speak as to the future although I hope the day will never come. But at this time it cannot be thought of that Canada, a young nation with everything to create, shall be drawn into the abyss of this expensive militarism. My hon. friends on the other side of the House have always been coquetting with this question, and they have always pointed to the adoption of the idea and, in so far as they could, they have pronounced in favour of it. In so far as the present government is concerned the matter came up in a concrete form at the conference of 1902. There, we had the proposal made to us in so many words that we should equip and maintain a body of troops for imperial service and make a yearly contribution to the navy. I shall not quote at length from the Blue-books on this subject. I prefer to take the resume of the proceedings of the conference of 1902 which was made last session by my hon.

friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for which I complimented him at the time and which I think I might read as a very fair resume of what took place at that conference. I will quote the proposal which was made to us by the Secretary of State for War in the very language of my hon. friend from North Toronto and I ask hon. gentlemen on the other side to listen to this. My hon. friend still speaking of the conference of 1902:

"With reference to military defence, no definite conclusion was reached at this conference. The Secretary of State for War and the Premier of New Zealand suggested an Imperial reserve, that is a special body of troops earmarked for Imperial service, and held ready in the different colonies for emergencies when they arose. Cape Colony and Natal agreed to that principle; Canada and Australia thought it best to raise the standard of the training of the general body of the army, leaving to the colonies to determine the number and the extent of the reserve, when an emergency arose, and were agreed that in that war zone would have been colonies that might arise from the being too rich of military resources, and a special reserve marked for a special purpose, and the other thrown alongside of them, the general militia of Canada. In that respect I am not at all saying that I do not think the position taken by Australia and Canada was a proper position. I am not here to comment on this today, but simply to make the review."

The main proposal that was made to us, as referred by the hon. member for North Toronto, was that we should equip a body of troops, earmark it and place it under the immediate command of the Secretary of State for War for Imperial purposes. Then, speaking of naval defence, my hon. friend thus referred to the proposal which was made to us:

"Sir John Forrest, Minister of Defence of Australia, the First Lord of the Admiralty, who I think at that time was the Right Hon. the Earl of Selborne, prepared a paper which was presented to the conference. The general line of his paper was that in the study of defence it is the best defence which is in a position to become aggressive when an emergency arises, that there was need not only of money but of man contribution; he would like to see each colony represented in the navy with vessels and with men from the colony. He thought the allocation in peace time would be easy, but all through his memorandum he stood unflinchingly for one control, absolute in case of war and in case of emergency. Some discussion took place but not very much at this stage and it was then decided that the conference should separate and that each colony should