

That embodied the proposition that is before the House to-day in a sense. What did the First Minister say in answer to that only two and a half years ago?

I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in our country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter.

The disproportion is too great between the mother country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the mother country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

What was before the country was his flat refusal to do anything in any respect. Then he says that this matter, having been before the country, there is now no necessity of submitting it to the people. We hear a great deal with reference to the right hon. gentleman's attitude by hon. members of this House, who endeavour to square it with his past record; we hear him eulogized by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who say that his name will go down through the annals of history when hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are not heard of. Well, it is to be hoped as he lived in history and ceases to act, his record will appear more consistent. Why, is it necessary that we should have some interest in the navy? They say: You are going to give \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 to England, and you will never see your money again. Is it not right that Canada should do something in recognition of the service which England has rendered this country in protecting her shores with her navy? Oh, well, they say, we want everything done in Canada. A few years ago hon. gentlemen opposite were not very anxious to have everything done in Canada. Now, they have changed their minds. We remember that a British shilling was not worth as much as an American dollar to hon. gentlemen opposite. British connection has been our protection and a contribution of \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 will have a wonderful moral effect upon the world. We will have for our protection more of a navy than we can build in Canada in the next twenty years. It will be a notification to the world

that the mother will be protected by the children that surround her in recognition of her past service. We talk about Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, &c., but there are no people in this country who are more interested and I believe more sincere in their wishes to maintain British connection than the French people of Quebec. Why? They realize that British connection means the continuance of the solid liberty which they possess. They do not wish to run the risk of having any change in that respect. Is there any necessity of our recognizing our obligation to British connection if you wish to speak of it in that way? I believe that it is the great bond that holds us together and gives us our security, liberty and permanence. What does it mean? The British navy means the great police force of the world. It does not mean militarism. It means that it has made it impossible for piracy to continue on the high seas. It means that it has been made impossible for the slave trade to continue, and it means that no citizen is so well protected and guarded in his rights as the man who is able to call himself a British subject. For these reasons, if for no other, and there are no higher or more consistent reasons, Canada ought to recognize the obligations which she owes to British connection and show that she is prepared to stand to the utmost against the world and do her duty to the empire to which she belongs. Is there a man in whose breast it does not awaken pride and respect to realize that he belongs to the British empire? Lord Rosebery said that it was the greatest secular force that the world had ever seen in the interest of peace, harmony and good. Are we not to lend our assistance and aid, our moiety and our arms, if need be, to continue that great moral force which secures to Canada and to all the people of the British empire that peace and prosperity which every one now enjoys under the Union Jack? The navy of England is regarded as one of the greatest factors contributing to the public peace. Are we to have no share in it? That is the simple question before the House to-day. We are going to have a navy which is going to be built in Canada. When are you going to construct the guns in Canada with which to equip these great vessels? Has the Minister of War any idea when we will be able to build these guns in Canada? When will you be able to make the plate to put upon these vessels in Canada? You talk about putting Canadians on these vessels, and rightly so, but the quickest way of putting Canadians on these vessels is to put them on British training ships on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, drill them there and have them ready for your navy when your navy is ready to float. The Minister of Militia and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken have talked a great deal about