

only too glad to receive. The original motion of my hon. friend, thus amended, was passed by the unanimous voice of parliament. It was in these terms.

Then he read the terms of the resolution I have already given to the house. He then discussed certain questions dealing with the recent election and the difficulties that had been experienced in Quebec and elsewhere in connection with his naval policy, and he said:

It has also been said in the province of Quebec during the last contest that we could rely on the Monroe doctrine. To anyone who would rely upon the Monroe doctrine, I would say, let him examine the record of Cuba after the Spanish-American war. When the Cubans were desirous of removing the yoke of Spain, they appealed to the United States for help, and they got it, but when, with the assistance of the United States, they had freed themselves from the control of Spain, they found that they had a rather high price to pay for the help they had received. That price was the abridgement of a portion of their independence. After the war was over, the people of Cuba naturally wanted to establish a regular government of their own. They called a convention and adopted a constitution, but that constitution had to go to Washington for revision, and there after three months' discussion, certain conditions were imposed upon Cuba, which to the people of that country were extremely distasteful, which convention they adopted by a narrow majority of five. The following conditions were made part of the constitution of Cuba:

Cuba shall not make any foreign treaty which may tend towards placing the independence of the island or any portion thereof in jeopardy; no loans can be issued unless a surplus of revenue is available for the service of such obligations; the United States can intervene to preserve the independence of Cuba or to ensure protection for life and property; the acts of the United States military administration in Cuba since 1898 are recognized as valid; proper hygienic precautions must be taken to protect public health on the island; the ownership of the Isle of Pines is left for future consideration; coaling stations shall be sold or leased to the United States in localities to be hereafter decided.

This shows how much Cuba had to discard of her sovereign power for the sake of the Monroe doctrine. We have to take our share in the defence, not only of our native shores, but of the empire as a whole. We can defend ourselves only by the assistance of the mother country.

The foregoing was followed by these words, after he had spoken of the Australian navy:

I insist once more upon what is stated in the memorandum: There is no emergency, there is no immediate danger, there is no prospective danger. If there were an emergency, if England were in danger—no, I will not use that expression; I will not say if England were in danger, but simply if England were on trial with one or two or more of the great powers of Europe, my right hon. friend might come and ask, not \$35,000,000, but twice, three times,

[Mr. Bennett.]

four times \$35,000,000. We would put at the disposal of England all the resources of Canada; there would not be a single dissentient voice.

Sir, I remember very well the question on that occasion, and those who were present in the house at that time cannot have forgotten it. This question gave rise to one of the most important debates, which, in the some thirty years of my experience, the parliament of Canada ever saw. I remember the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), an excellent speech, one of the very best he ever made, and that is paying a great compliment, well-deserved.

He was speaking of the debate on the resolution to which I have just referred:

I remember the speech of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) the present Prime Minister, and if ever a man gave reasons against the policy which he has now introduced, my right hon. friend gave those reasons on that occasion.

He was dealing with the question of there being no emergency. He proceeds:

Now, sir, I ask, why is it that my right hon. friend and his first lieutenant, the leaders of the opposition then, who to-day have the responsibility of office, will not go on with the policy so forcibly put forward by them, instead of a policy under which, in the language of my right hon. friend, there will be no preparation of the soil or beginning or growth of the product of defence? The reason, sir, is not far to seek. The reason is well known: there is one, and only one, and it is because this subject of imperial defence has been made the subject of contentious politics.

That position he amplified in the course of his speech, and he proceeded with the following statement:

I hope it is true, but would not the impression be much greater yet, if, instead of this money contribution, the nations of Europe were to see the young daughters of the empire, the young nations scattered over the whole world, building fleets of their own, to use the language of the resolution of 1909—

“in cooperation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire, and the peace of the world.”

After referring to the ships at sea and the unfurling of the white ensign, he then proceeded:

Australia has adopted the same policy, and she has adopted it for the reason stated by my hon. friend in the debate of 1909: that having tried contribution, she found that contribution would not work. Australia, therefore, came to the conclusion which we came to: she came to the conclusion that gentlemen now sitting on the government benches came to, but which they have abandoned, and abandoned for what reason? For no other reason than the well-known reason of their alliance with the Nationalist party of Quebec.