

as any Tory journalist would have written who was a prophet and saw a Government victory ahead. And when he got the result of the election, I am told, he nearly fainted. I refer to the election to say that the result of that contest in the province of Ontario has had far more to do with the dropping of the Naval Bill than even the action of the Senate itself. I cannot understand the method of discussion followed by this Government and by its right hon. leader. I should have thought that he would have admitted that there had been an enormous change in the position of naval matters since last session. The fact is that during the recess there has been a great clarifying of the empire's position in the naval issue.

My right hon. friend mentioned the memorandum of Mr. Winston Churchill, the first memorandum, and he actually defended his contribution policy in a kind of postscript by referring to that memorandum. He seems to forget that in the course of the debate his first memorandum went by the board, and Mr. Churchill sent a second. The second memorandum shifted the trouble from the North sea a thousand miles to Gibraltar rock. The right hon. leader of this House is very curious in his dealings with Mr. Churchill. First, he goes with Mr. Churchill, he bases himself on what Mr. Churchill sends him; and then, at the end of the session, he takes him up once more and makes a considerable part of his speech by reading from recent speeches of Mr. Churchill in Great Britain. The whole case of contribution was a case of emergency, and the emergency disappeared when the fleet went to Gibraltar. And if it disappeared at that time, where is the emergency to-day? My right hon. friend knows, and every one of his supporters knows, that the fleet has been dispersed to the seven seas and the German fleet with it—and every lover of civilization is very glad to see that come about. And that dispersal of the fleet is the second absolute justification of all that the Opposition did last winter, whether it was in the House of Commons or in the Senate. If they required further justification for their attitude, if they required any further defense as being as good British Empire men as sit on the other side of the House, it would be found in the fact that during the recess the little colony of New Zealand has given up the policy of contribution and has taken the policy of the Liberal Opposition in this Parliament.

Now, I want to come a little nearer to the amendment and dwell upon some other

[Mr. Michael Clark].

aspects of the Address. I felicitate the Government on being able to announce an increase in the foreign commerce of the country. By the way, I am the only man in this House, if it be true that I am the only free trader in the House, who can thoroughly and properly rejoice in that paragraph. The contradictions of protection are most wonderful things. We have a Government which puts a paragraph in the Address rejoicing in the extension of our foreign commerce, and then lecturing me, a solitary free trader, for a year after that on the importance of a home market. I do not know what right the Government has to rejoice at the extension of foreign commerce in a protection country. However, there are some things in connection with our foreign commerce which would give students of economics good reason to pause. The fact is that our foreign trade has been largely increased by the increase in prices, and that the increase of exports is not anything like what it should be if Canada were doing her duty in the development of her resources. As a free trader, I am confronted not only with this paragraph of the Address, but with another very interesting spectacle. Under the predecessors of my hon. friends opposite we had eighteen years of what has been called the National Policy; then we had sixteen years under a Liberal Government, with what I am bound to confess were somewhat microscopic modifications of that policy; then we have had two more years of a continuation of the policy with the microscopic modifications. Now I am confronted with an amendment to the Address asking us to recognize that the Government has taken no steps to remedy the depression of trade in this country. It is a remarkable spectacle; there is something wrong with the country. The slogan 'leave well enough alone' now appears to be supplanted on the part of this Government by the slogan 'leave ill enough alone.' I do not think that at the present moment, despite the brave show my right hon. friend puts on this matter, that he would repeat his slogan of two years ago, and tell us to 'leave well enough alone.' In the presence of this depression, which the Government sees fit to admit, what do they do? They fall back upon the boundless resources of the country. Well, the boundless resources of the country, Mr. Speaker, are not an asset peculiar to this Government; they were in existence when there was practically nothing in the country except buffaloes and Indians, but they did not make a prosperous and happy country. What is wanted by the country is