

I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and, in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war, are ill-advised and dangerous.

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think those of us who have given some attention and some study to the important matter which is now submitted to the House, will readily admit that never, in this or any other parliament since confederation, indeed I might say never at any time since we have possessed the privilege of self government in this country, has any question of this magnitude and of such vast consequences, been discussed in the free assemblies of this country. The Bill in itself outside of section 18 does not present to my mind any very striking feature; it is the extension, if I may use such an expression, of legislation which we have had in a diminished form upon our statutes ever since the mother country called upon us to assume our proper share of the burden of defence. Therefore, I think one may say with the exception I have just pointed out, this legislation is not in any sense extraordinary. But it must be viewed, I submit, under all the surrounding circumstances, and particularly, as a first step towards the execution of a policy or what

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

I called at another stage of this Bill, an agreement arrived at with the imperial authorities. At that time my right hon. friend stated that what he was endeavouring to carry out was not an agreement but a policy, and that statement was covered by the applause of those who sit behind him. But I see no material difference between the two names, what we are doing now, as I understand it, is carrying out a policy of defence, that was laid down at the last imperial conference held during last summer. It therefore seems to me of the utmost importance that we should all understand clearly what is the course upon which it is sought to have the country embark. My right hon. friend might have given that to us in a very few words this afternoon; but so far as I was able to apprehend the meaning of his speech, he confined himself, as he usually does, to brilliant generalities, speaking with the eloquence that characterizes him. But is this a proper occasion, I would ask, on which to deal in generalities? Was it not more fitting, at this important stage of the measure when we are asked to affirm the principle, that he should leave aside those historical allusions to the greatness of the empire, to the long forgotten career of Peter the Hermit, and such things as that, and tell us clearly what it is to which he is now asking us to commit ourselves.

My hon. friend has spoken of differences of opinion in the ranks of the party on this side of the House. They may exist, but they are acknowledged. Let me say to him that, when, on a question of this magnitude, we do not find it possible to see eye to eye on all phases of the question, we acknowledge it openly, instead of trying to cover it with a veil, and to convey in a different manner, in different places, and at different periods, the meaning of a policy which it seems impossible to grasp and to thoroughly understand. Therefore I say it is incumbent upon us to take all proper means that there shall be no mistake on that point. That is the reason why there is, on the ministerial side of the House, that apparent acquiescence and unanimity which, as every body knows, merely conceals the grinding of teeth which otherwise would be apparent among them. How, I ask, are those gentlemen held together? No doubt what the government organs and my right hon. friend himself have stated at different times and at different places, explains it; no doubt, in the confusion which reigns among them, they do not fully apprehend the real aspects of this question, and I have heard muttered here a moment ago that patronage possibly is the explanation. I told my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) a day or two ago that I was sorry I could not be here, through illness, to uphold by word of mouth and