

upon the Chinese coast, and envies Canada and Australia the fleets which they are to possess, man and operate.

It is not for me to offer any suggestions to my hon. friends on the other side, but I may venture to ask them to reflect upon this—that if the British empire is to remain strong as it is to-day, it will not be by compelling the daughter nations to revolve as satellites around the mother country but by allowing every daughter nation to develop itself to the fullest extent possible so that it may add strength to the whole.

Now, I have presented to the House one side of the opinion amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. There is also another side. I have presented the side of the ardent; now I come to consider the side of the supine. But if I qualify those who are inactive by applying to them the word 'supine,' I use a term that is not sufficiently strong. If I were to do them justice, I think I should be obliged, if I may do so without violating parliamentary propriety, to borrow a term from American political slang and say that these gentlemen are of the party of the 'stand-patters.' The chief of that class is my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think it quite right to discuss this question, referring to papers in the case and not give those papers to parliament? I do not think it is at all fair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is just as fair for me to answer the speech of my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier as it was for him to make that speech before the papers are laid before the House.

Mr. MONK. But it is an ordinary rule of debate that an hon. member should not, in speaking in this House, refer to papers that are not before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And it would have been well for the hon. gentlemen not to speak outside of parliament until he had the papers before him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) might have told his hearers that there had been an occasion when he might properly have spoken. He might have spoken last session when this resolution was before the House and when others spoke though he did not. He has changed his mind apparently. At a banquet which was tendered him in the town of Lachine, in the division of Jacques Cartier, he might then have told his friends that he had lost a good opportunity of thundering his objections to this policy last session. I recollect that my hon. friend was in his seat on the 29th of March last. He did not speak—he stood pat even then; he did not offer any objection, nor did he by speaking express approval. But on the more recent occasion

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

to which I allude he did not hesitate to speak, and spoke apparently by the book. He gave a wealth of objections against the policy adopted here last session, and in which he was a participator in that he did not challenge a vote upon the question. He voted for the resolution, but, having voted for it, without more information than he has to-day he chooses to attack the policy of the government, the policy of his own party, and to declare that he will not stand by it. That was what the hon. gentleman did just eight days ago to-day.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not competent for my right hon. friend to discuss a subject referred to in a speech from the Throne and in that connection to refer to documents which are to be produced unless those documents are laid upon the table of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not discussing any question which is not properly before the House; I am discussing a resolution passed by parliament last session and an attack made upon that resolution by my hon. friend eight days ago to-day.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have your ruling on the point, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is the well-known practice that if reference is made to documents, those documents must be produced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What reference have I made to documents? I would have much preferred that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) should not discuss this question until the papers are before the House; but when he chooses to attack the policy of a resolution passed in this House, speaking in the province of Quebec and attempting to arouse prejudice there, I have the right to refer to it here. The speech which he delivered—

Mr. MONK. I do not think that such an imputation should be made by my right hon. friend unless he is prepared to point out what language of mine was designed to arouse prejudice.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell the hon. gentleman at once. The hon. gentleman told the audience which he addressed eight days ago to-day that our project of building a navy would cost annually \$20,000,000. I say that that is an appeal to prejudice. If it was not, what was it? My hon. friend will be glad to know, I am sure, when those papers are brought down, that he was altogether astray. My hon. friend will be glad to know that his assertion was not only astray, but was three or four times astray, and I presume that when he sees the papers they will cause him no little surprise. Then, to undecieve the good electors of Jacques Cartier who, since his speech have been unable to sleep