

who, in case of war, would require the protection of the Canadian navy, it is the farming community. I speak from a purely material point of view, because from the national point of view, I assume that we would all be happy to defend this country and to co-operate loyally with the imperial navy if need be. Let me give a few figures. In the calendar year 1908, the Canadian farmer sold his products outside of Canada to the extent of about \$308,100,000. Briefly, if you took it in bulk to Great Britain in that year, we sold to the value of \$97,400,000; to the United States, \$3,200,000; to other countries, \$7,350,000. In other words, the mother country took from us 90.2 per cent of all our agricultural exports. In view of these figures, does not the security of the British market mean something to us, and especially to our farming community? Great Britain takes from us nine-tenths of the products of our farms. Those who believe that the farmers will be led astray by the do-nothing policy, are strangely astray themselves. I know that the farmers of this country are intelligent enough, in case of danger, to defend the trade routes, so as to protect the cargoes of food supply conveyed from Canada to the mother country.

Now, what are the objections made to the naval policy of the government?

1. It is stated in the province of Quebec by the friends of my hon. friend, that there is no need of a navy for Canada, because we are protected by the United States through the Monroe doctrine;

2. That we have no obligations towards Great Britain;

3. That the Prime Minister of Canada and his party have not kept their pledge on the question of militarism;

4. That Canada will not control her navy;

5. That there should be a plebiscite before any policy is affirmed.

Let me answer briefly to the objections I have enumerated. It is contended in Quebec that we do not require any protection because in case of war, we will be protected by the Monroe doctrine; if we were attacked, Uncle Sam would come to our rescue.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend mention the name of anybody who has advanced that theory?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I read it, in the first place, in the Blue press of the province of Quebec; in the next place, it was expounded the other evening, during a three hours' speech, by the ally of my hon. friend, the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa. If that is the policy of the little Canadians, how undignified that language is, especially if it is endorsed by a gentleman in whose veins runs blue blood; how undignified it is that we, a free people on this con-

Mr. LEMIEUX.

continent, should dream of relying upon the United States for defence in case we were attacked. Mark well, Sir, those who invoke the Monroe doctrine claim that they are better Canadians than we are; they denounce us as traitors to our country and our constitution. What is the effect of the Monroe doctrine? Does it apply to Canada? Every one who has read history knows that between 1811 and 1823 the Spanish dependencies of South America and of Central America declared their independence. That was at the time of the congress of Vienna, quite an historical event, at the beginning of the last century, in Europe. Then, was formed among the large nations of the world what has been called in history, the Holy Alliance. It was feared in the United States that the Bourbon dynasty, which had been ousted from its throne in Spain, might be represented in South America or Central America by one of its descendants. Then it was that President Monroe, backed by the diplomacy of Great Britain, through the strong hand of one of her best diplomats, Canning, issued the famous message which has since become historical. Let me quote from that message to see how it would apply to Canada:

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favour of the liberty and happiness of their fellowmen on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. The difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it therefore to candour and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any position of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

And then the President adds:

With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere.

So, if the Monroe doctrine is the consolation of the so-called anti-militarist party, let me say to them that in case of the invasion of Canada by a foreign power, we could not rely on the help of the United States. There is nothing