

hoisted the flag of independence and Britain, intent on keeping the balance of power in Europe, did not want Spain to declare war against the new Spanish republics. The Monroe doctrine was enunciated to meet that situation. The United States were interested in maintaining the independence and freedom of the new Latin republics. It has been recognized since those days, and lately by no less an authority than Mr. Taft, that the Munroe doctrine does not apply to Canada. It was not formulated because of Canada but at the suggestion of Canning to be applied by the United States in the case of the new born republics of South America.

I do not like to hear in the Canadian Parliament these fiery sentiments when one speaks of the relations of the United States, Great Britain and Canada. There are a few Americans who believe that they can only be good Americans by virtue of the tail-twisting process during a presidential campaign. There are those jingoos here who believe that they are good Britishers only when they can pluck a few feathers from the tail of the American eagle. They do not represent public opinion in Great, and Greater, Britain any more than those jingoos to the south of us, represent the true spirit of the American republic. If there are two nations which are closely united in this world by common traditions and ideals it is the American Commonwealth and Great Britain. We are in the happy position of standing between Great Britain and the United States of America. No fear of a war; no fear of a contest. It will never exist between these two great countries where liberal ideas of tolerance and freedom have been consecrated for many centuries.

Sir, there is no cause for the display of jingoism which occurs at every general election, when the name of the United States or when the name of Great Britain appears in certain yellow newspapers. We have the faces before us and we have history behind us. For a century the United States of America and Canada, without any fortifications, without any soldiers, without the firing of a shot in anger, have maintained peace along 3,000 miles of boundary line. That is the best evidence that there never can be war between the United States and Great Britain. There are always a few clouds, on the horizon, but any one can detect the silver lining. Let us not forget that we are passing through a presidential election. When we are passing through elections ourselves many good people in the United States think there are a few madmen

too in Canada? We had evidence of that in the campaign of 1911 and during the campaign in 1917. It was then as it was in the old days, when George Brown alone in Canadian journalism stood for the cause of the North as against the South. There were then members of Parliament applauding and cheering at the news of the defeat of the North. That caused us the abrogation of the first reciprocity treaty, by the way.

Sir, I am and I have always been, in favour of a Canadian navy. I repeat what I said the other evening. Much as I differ from my hon. friend the Minister of Naval Affairs I say that he stands by his old ideals and that his common sense makes him firm in his stand. He knows that the Laurier policy was a national policy. He party with him as they are ready to accept after ten years has elapsed, the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I congratulate him. It is a piece of diplomacy well worth being remembered. I am for a Canadian naval policy for the reasons that were adduced in 1909 in the House of Commons. Because it meant the creation of a new national institution, and a response to the demands of the future; because it meant that Canada was taking on her shoulders the burden of national defence which naturally appertains to Canada; because it meant the development of national life and self-government within the Empire which brought us liberty, honour and peace. I was for the expenditure of our own money in our own way. I was for it because it meant the employment of our own men, of our own sailors, of our own mechanics, and the opening up of new channels for the activity, ambition and enthusiasm of our young men. These are the reason why in 1910 I stood behind my revered leader in the advocacy of a Canadian navy. But as I said a moment ago, that naval policy was a bone of contention during the general election of 1911 and we know what was the attitude of the party sitting in front of me on that issue.

New conditions have arisen. A war—the greatest of all wars—has taken place. It was a war which meant the end of all wars. We have taken a noble part in that war. My hon. friend the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) should apologise to the yeomanry of Canada for his pretended shame and humiliation. He claims he was humiliated at the idea that a certain political party objected to the policy he is now supporting. He should apologise for his humiliation to the yeomanry of Canada. Fight-