

House ought to be based on argument, not on excitement or emotion.

My hon. friend made a great deal of a statement of the premier in his address, which he repeated to the very great amusement of hon. gentlemen opposite. That was why I put myself out of order by making the remark I did. My hon. friend sought to contribute to the amusement of his friends in the House by trying to show how ridiculous was the simple statement of the premier that when Britain was at war, Canada was at war, and if Britain was at war Canada might not be at war. Now, Sir, the amusing thing to me was that a man would demonstrate the simplicity, and, if my hon. friend will excuse me, the vanity, of thinking that he could amuse or please his friends by a simple repetition of phrases. My hon. friend never attempted to analyse the statement of the premier. It never occurred to him that after all there might be something in that statement. When the premier made that statement, as a plain man, deducing plain facts from simple arguments, it was very easy for me at least to see that Britain might be at war without any necessity for Canada being at war. It does not follow that Britain may not in very many instances be engaged in hostilities at different parts of the empire, none of which would be sufficiently important to necessitate calling in the aid of this country; and if I can understand the deductions of common sense, that is exactly what the premier meant by the statement he made.

Now, I want to ask the House to bear with me for a few minutes while I discuss the three principles which are before the House. We are called upon as members of this House to vote for one of three things; first, the policy of the government; second, the policy of the leader of the opposition; third the policy of the member for Jacques Cartier. What were the circumstances that gave rise to the consideration of this question? How is it that suddenly, within a year, we are called upon to consider and determine the question of providing in this country for naval protection involving millions of dollars of expenditure? The condition arose from the fact that a year ago some strange emotion and excitement took possession of certain gentlemen in the old country and spread to kindred political spirits in this country, and that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), becoming suddenly alarmed for the safety and security of the empire, brought up a motion in this House for the discussion of this question. As the result of that discussion, the right hon. the Prime Minister proposed to amend the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition made an arrange-

Mr. RALPH SMITH.

ment, with the consent of his friends, whereby whatever resolution might be adopted at that particular time, should express the unanimous feeling of both sides of the House. That, in my opinion, was an ideal condition for the consideration of a question of this importance affecting this country and the empire at large. The proposal suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) was amended by the right hon. the leader of the government and again amended by a change suggested by the hon. the leader of the opposition, and the proposition in its final shape was unanimously agreed to. Where was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) at that particular moment? In view of the position he has since taken, in the discussion on this Bill, what excuse has he to offer for his inertness and inaction on that occasion? He had nothing to say a year ago when this resolution was unanimously adopted, but no sooner did this government commit itself to a proposal to do something to strengthen the naval forces of the empire than the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) declares that he never believed there was anything in this excitement regarding the naval forces of Great Britain, that it was purely fictitious and had spread from the old country to Canada. But if that were his conviction, when was the proper time for him to have expressed it? I submit that it was when the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) submitted his resolution when that resolution was being discussed in this House; but the hon. gentleman, instead of doing this, left his seat and went out of the House and abandoned his duty, and he did this, although he was at the time convinced that an exciting condition had arisen in this country which was not based on facts. Then was the proper time for the hon. gentleman to have made the criticism which he made a year later, and in neglecting to do so, I charge him with having failed in his duty. But a year later, when this tremendous excitement was cooling off, and things were coming to a normal condition, was the time he chose to show his temper and his teeth to his own friends and dispute the methods taken by his own political colleagues, and to show his anxiety to protect the empire by an amendment asking that the whole question be submitted to the votes and opinion of the people. I could not help being reminded of the old lines:

When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
When the devil got well, the devil a monk was he.

The time for my hon. friend to have asserted his convictions and used his influence was at the beginning of the excitement but he shirked his duty. The