

occasion for him to have corrected the wrong impression was just the one when he failed to do his duty.

Just a word more about my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). It is amusing to consider the position of my hon. friend in contrast with the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan). That hon. gentleman spoke for two hours last night, and during nine-tenths of that time he was facing the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. One could not help feeling that really his arguments, his influence and his declamation, were directed almost solely for the benefit of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. He kept steadily looking that hon. gentleman in the face, although using words that might, by a wave of the hand, be sent across to the government benches, still it seemed to me that the hon. gentleman was really saying: Those fellows are bad enough, but you are a long ways worse, and I consider you are really a more dangerous factor as opposed to the empire than even are hon. members opposite.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) expressed great dissatisfaction with British diplomacy. He went on to remind the House of a statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister that if the supremacy of Britain on the sea should be weakened, the strength and integrity of Canada would be jeopardized, and expressed his dissent from that proposition. Then he proceeded to depreciate British diplomacy and the effects in Canada of that diplomacy. Well, I myself, am a little jealous in favour of Britain and British diplomacy. I am myself an Englishman, just a few years in this country, but while I do not question the loyalty of Canadians to Britain, what I do say is this, that no man is in a position to doubt the wisdom of British diplomacy who refuses to spend a dollar for the protection of his own country. Britain has undoubtedly, in her diplomatic negotiations, to make compromises, but it must be remembered that she has to protect every country within the empire, and all her diplomatic resources had to be exercised in favour of the empire; and in my opinion any hon. member who—as my hon. friend did in a very bitter speech—opposes the idea of Canada making any contribution or any effort in her own defence or that of the empire is hardly in a position to question the effectiveness of British diplomacy. Great Britain has had to make the best settlements she could. She has had to give as well as take. If her diplomatists insisted on taking every time, they would have had to fight every time. They had to consider grievances; they had to give as well as take. If they took every time, they would have to fight every time. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier de-

mands of the British diplomats only consideration of the interests of the empire on every occasion, and yet he insists that not a man and not a dollar should be contributed by Canada in the defence of this country either by land or by sea. I submit that no argument has been presented by any member of this House so politically cowardly as that of the hon. member (Mr. Monk). If he was right in remembering the faults of British diplomacy he should have considered also the difficulties under which British diplomacy operated. I do not say that every negotiation in the past has been carried on to the best interests of the empire, but I do say that the men who had the responsibility of carrying on these negotiations did the best they could in the interests of the empire. And, if there is to be a reflection on British diplomacy, it ought to come from men who are willing to back up their opinions with their own strength and their own money, and not from men such as a prominent leader of a great political party who reflects upon the diplomacy of the British authorities and yet refuses to spend a dollar to protect his own rights.

Now, I dispose of the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as being outside the practical politics of the empire. For my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has placed himself outside the empire in his discussion of this question. I come now to the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). That amendment contains two principles: First, that we should make a voluntary gift of a sufficient sum to build two Dreadnoughts, and do it immediately on the assumption that there is an immediate emergency; second, that the question of naval defence in Canada should be submitted to the consideration of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the strongest speech that could be made against the amendment of the leader of the opposition to-day would be an accumulation of the expressions of the leader of the opposition and his friends just a year ago. Within the last few days, I have spent several hours reading these speeches, reading them in the light of the amendment which the leader of the opposition has now placed before you, and I propose to give some passages that have not been recited from the speeches of such hon. members as the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and my good friend from the city of Victoria (Mr. Barnard)—interested as he is;—and I want to select a few very short passages (for I do not like to read extracts) to show that the arguments of these gentlemen a year ago are the strongest answers that could