

tives, with the British Minister at Washington, for instance, and working out the details of the treaty. That was the second step. The next step, concurrent almost with that, was that no treaty would be forced on any colony without the assent of that colony, and in 1893 the next step forward was made when Sir Charles Tupper was appointed plenipotentiary by Great Britain, and when he went to Paris and with Lord Dufferin, the British Minister to Paris, entered into negotiations with the gentlemen who conducted the matter for France, Sir Charles Tupper carrying out absolutely all the negotiations, the British minister simply introducing him, simply giving him all the resources at his command, and after Sir Charles Tupper and the French minister had arranged the treaty it was signed by Lord Dufferin, signed by Sir Charles Tupper and signed by the French minister, and it became a treaty. From beginning to end there was absolutely no constitutional or practical difference between the matter in 1893 and the matter in 1907. What is the use of reading history backwards and trying to make it appear that under this regime a great advance forward has been taken and a great right has been wrested from the British government? The right hon. gentleman said that Canada knew her own business best and could do her own business best. So Canada can up to a certain point, but everyone of us with half an ounce of common sense in his head knows that there is one thing Canada cannot do. She cannot make a treaty and she cannot enforce a treaty. Just as long as the present constitutional circumstances and conditions stand Canada may have all the say in reference to her own business in the way of a treaty with another country, as to-day she has, but she has to say it in a constitutional way, and when the treaty is signed it is Great Britain's plenipotentiaries who sign it and when the treaty is completed it is the power of Britain that enforces that treaty.

We have the other legend and that is wholly made by the right hon. gentleman himself. That is the all-red route.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He forgot that.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman forgot it. He did not forget it when he came back to Quebec for this is what he said:

During the last five days of the conference I announced a new idea which has almost become historic—the all-red line.

Is it possible that the right hon. gentleman uttered these words?

My proposition was the establishment at once of fast boats on the Atlantic and Pacific. I am thoroughly convinced that my ideas are in the interest of Canada and the empire, and although I have grown old and white in the service of the country I am prepared to work with all my energy to further the cause.

Mr. FOSTER.

That was the new idea. The all-red route. What was it?—a fast line of steamship communication from Great Britain to Canada, fast railway communication across Canada, as fast as possible steamship communication with the Orient, Australia and New Zealand. That was the new idea, and I see it written in this book that when the matter came before the conference Sir Wm. Lynne, the Finance Minister of Australia, said that they had been advocating that for ten years in Australia, and that they called it there the all-red line. Ten years ago! Five days ago! Memory at fault! Historical accuracy! Who is responsible? Sir Wm. Lynne or is it my right hon. friend? But we need not pursue that further. My right hon. friend was here in 1888, he was here in 1889, he was here in 1900; he was here and he and his followers fought with tooth and nail the proposal of the Liberal-Conservatives of that day to put on the statute a subsidy for fast line steamers across the Pacific running to China and Japan, New Zealand and Australia, and for a fast line across the Atlantic, both lines contributed to by Great Britain and by Canada, by New Zealand and Australia as well and the whole argument was the all-red line, as swift communication as we possibly could have between London, Vancouver, Hong-Kong, Yokohama, Auckland, Melbourne and Sydney.

That was the slogan of the Liberal-Conservative party then and in spite of the efforts of these gentlemen the legislation was put on the statute book, the steamers were put upon the ocean, the subsidies were contributed and with reference to the Atlantic side, the contract was made and within two or three years we would have had the actuality resulting from the contract, but my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thought it was no thing to conjure with, the all red line; he tore up the contract and went into the bottlenecked steamer business and the Petersen and Tait business, until after dilly-dallying for years, prices rose so that in those days they were frightened at the amount of money that would have to be paid to get an all-red line. I must tell my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) candidly that I doubt if he added much to his own reputation and to the reputation of Canada by the course he pursued in that conference with reference to the all-red line. On the 14th day of the sessions of that conference, only one day before it rose, he put in a resolution demanding that there and then steps should be taken to put on a 24-knot service across the Atlantic and an 18-knot minimum service on the Pacific, and that Great Britain and Canada, Australia and New Zealand, should contribute to the same in equitable shares—and he occupied three minutes or less in putting that proposition before that conference. There sat the British government, represented by business men; there sat the representatives