

pire against every possible risk would not probably achieve its object as completely as would be done by merely initiating proper movements of defence and consenting with regard to the rest to incur some risk.

The great trouble about all these discussions is that the very starting of the idea of danger, the mentioning of another nation as possibly coming in conflict with Great Britain, the statement that the British empire may soon be involved in war with Germany, the very consideration of the subject, tends to produce in both nations a spirit that inevitably must help to lead to war. Let me say in regard to this country, that I do not think that any real danger of trouble in the future is likely to come from any of those gentlemen in this House, or throughout the country, who are frequently made the objects of attack as being disloyal and traitorous to the empire, but rather from the ultra-loyal gentlemen, who, not being satisfied with their devotion to the British empire, must exhibit on all possible occasions their hatred and detestation of all other nations. It does not seem to me that the man is extremely loyal, however much he may think he is, who, not satisfied with loving and serving to the utmost his own country, but thinks it necessary to pin-prick and create hostility in the minds of other nations and incur difficulties in the future. I believe, myself, that a moderate course in this regard is the proper course. I do not believe that it is wise for us to continue to the extent even that we do to-day this policy of endeavouring to dominate the world. It is enough for the British government to dominate the British empire, it is enough for the people of Canada to dominate the vast domain which they possess. More than that, is a spirit which is provocative of war. It may lead to the ultimate destruction of civilization if we are not satisfied with controlling our own dominions and treating other people with that same respect and regard with which we wish them to treat us. I heard a gentleman, not long ago, not in this House, but elsewhere, state that our children and, if not our children, our children's children, would see the time when Canada would dominate the whole of this continent. Could anything be more absurd than an idea of that kind? Could a gentleman who expects to see his children, or his children's children dominating this continent, including the great republic to the south of us, which has so much power to-day that it would have no great difficulty in dominating this country if it desired to do so, complain if the Americans say, if this is the spirit which is to dominate civilization, we will be guided by it also, and we will attempt to dominate the American continent? Lord Beaconsfield originated the absurd policy, which he was obliged to withdraw, the policy of claiming for Great Britain as-

scendency in the councils of Europe. Why has Great Britain to arrogate to herself ascendancy in the councils of Europe? Does Great Britain expect to have ascendancy in the councils of France, of Germany, and of Russia? Is it not to be expected that Frenchmen, Germans and Russians will resent such a policy, and what would be thought if they attempted themselves to dominate any portion of the British empire? It is not the spirit that should dominate the Canadian people in endeavouring to aid the British empire and her colonies.

Now, I shall come more directly to the question before the House, although I think that the discussion that I have already entered into is incidental to the assertion contained in the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), that there is an emergency which requires this aid. I think what I have said is germane to that in showing that there is no more evidence of hostility to-day than there was on every one of those previous occasions, and history shows that every one of these panics was so utterly and inexcusably absurd as to render the old gentlemen who created them absolutely a subject of laughter to those who read the history of that time.

Let us come directly to the question: What is it necessary Canada should do, having due regard to her own self respect, in the way of taking part in the defence of the great empire to which we belong? There are several courses before Canada. I am not speaking now as to the form of the defence, but as to whether she shall continue to rely upon the defence afforded by the vast naval power of Great Britain? If Canada is to continue to do that then no one who has any regard for his self respect could refuse to aid in a reasonable and proper proportion in the defence afforded to Canada by the British navy. One gentleman, in his newspaper, has repeatedly opposed the policy of the government as well as the policy of granting two Dreadnoughts, and he has said that Canada for her defence is amply provided for if she depend upon the Monroe doctrine. Well, I am one of those who believe that there is no reason why the Munroe doctrine—which by the way originated with a great British minister—should not supplement materially in assisting not merely in the defence of Canada, but in the defence of the whole empire. But I do say this, and I think most Canadians will concur in this view, that even if we were safe under the protection of the Munroe doctrine, the self respect of a courageous people, such as undoubtedly the Canadian people are, will not let them accept such defence without contributing their portion of assistance towards what is required to maintain the Munroe doctrine. Therefore,