

in the House voted against it. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) voted for it. My hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) voted for it. I mention that because, when the amendment of the present Minister of Public Works was put immediately afterwards, up stepped the Minister of Trade and Commerce from his seat and sneaked out of the door behind the Speaker's Chair, and out stepped the hon. member for Centre Toronto and hurried out the rear door. A moment after, when the amendment of the Minister of Public Works was put, two names are omitted from the voting list, either pro or con—one the present Minister of Trade and Commerce and the other the present member for Centre Toronto. There was one man, however, in this House on the Conservative side who had the courage of his convictions; I refer to the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes). He refused, and he was the only one who openly refused to vote for the Nationalist amendment; he voted against it. The balance of the Conservative party voted for it, except two who as, I have already said flew the coop. That was the condition when the speech from the Throne was read last year.

Now, another question has intervened in the meantime, a question which has engaged very largely the attention of the electors in all the provinces of Canada to the exclusion, I think, of most other questions. In the province of Ontario I do not think the navy question was discussed at all during the recent election; at all events, I did not hear it. The discussion was purely and simply on the trade proposals. The verdict on polling day was certainly a decisive one and was against the then government's proposal. But I believe in the province of Quebec there was not a fair, unprejudiced, unbiased discussion of the trade issues at all. The predominant discussion in that province was the discussion which the so-called Nationalist party thrust upon the people, and was nothing more or less than an absolute condemnation of the then Prime Minister of Canada, charging him with being too British, too imperial, and a condemnation of the navy policy of the government, in which promises of all kinds were made, that if the Liberal party were defeated we would have heard the last of naval defence throughout the Dominion of Canada.

Under conditions so marked in the province of Quebec, and with no other great issue before the people, the people having disposed at the election of the question of trade relations with the United States, was it not to be expected that in the speech from the Throne there would have been some pronouncement by the government as to its naval policy? The absence of any

suggestion in that respect emphasized the situation. People all over the country thought, why does not the Prime Minister state what he and his government intend to do? But not a word, not a reference in the speech from the Throne to the great question of naval defence in the Dominion of Canada, and for the support of the British Empire.

Now, there is a history to this question, and I am going to be very brief as I discuss it. This question was brought before this House for the first time in a most admirable manner by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. It had not then become a political football; it was a question on which all parties agreed. They agreed to establish a Canadian navy first of all, with schools for the training of cadets and officers, and to build a fleet in our own country, under the supervision of course of the British Admiralty. That resolution stands to-day as the unanimous decision of the House of Commons in March, 1909, and it was approved time and again by the present leader of the government—in his speech at the Dominion day banquet in London in the same year, and in his speech at the banquet in Halifax after his return. We were all one on that question until when? The date of the bye-election of Drummond and Arthabaska.

All went well until that day and then my hon. friend the leader of the government and his colleagues seemed to have fallen from the high plane which they took in regard to naval defence in this country. Fell for what purpose, for what object? To grasp at any thing? Yes to grasp at the Nationalist vote in the province of Quebec. Not openly. No, they would not take part openly, their supporters in the province of Ontario would not permit it; but by fair means or by foul they meant to get control of that vote. I am sorry to say in looking over the result of the last elections in the province of Quebec, though the Nationalists may be but small in numbers they are well scattered throughout the country, and that element rallying to the support of Conservative candidates in riding after riding were strong enough in many of the ridings to change the complexion of that province to some extent. But we are thankful that the great bulk of that province still remains loyal and true. To what? To the naval defence of this country for the protection of Canada and the protection of the empire. My hon. friend the First Minister need not imagine that he can simply say in regard to the naval question: 'Give us time,' we have only had a month or two months. Give us time and we will decide upon what we are going to do.' He has to do more than that. This country is committed at the present moment to a naval policy. The navy has been