

only a beginning. My hon. friend should know that this gift is offered to us from the Admiralty through Lord Jellicoe, in order that Canada should assume for the future all expenditure involved in the up-keep of a greater navy. My hon. friend went on to say that he was humiliated, when on the other side in 1916 he visited the British fleet after the battle of Jutland and saw the name "Canada" inscribed on one of His Majesty's ships. He felt rather cheap at the idea that Canada had not contributed one red cent towards the maintenance of that ship. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he felt ashamed on that visit I am rather pleased to hear him make the confession, because it is the first sign of repentance by one of those loyal Tories of 1910 who opposed so bitterly the Canadian navy, which whilst protecting Canada could meet the emergencies that might confront the British Empire. My hon. friend should not have forgotten the events of 1909-10. The policy which is being propounded this evening by the Minister of Naval Affairs was evolved by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Government. It was introduced first in 1909 in the form of a resolution which was amended, the amendment being accepted unanimously by both sides of the House. In 1910 the Government came before Parliament with a Canadian policy, the naval Bill whose principal features were read a moment ago by my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong). He now has the brass—pardon me, Mr. Chairman, the use of the expression—to say that he did not oppose it! I have not the Votes and Proceedings under my hand, but I know that my hon. friend voted against that Bill in the House on the third reading. And when he speaks of humiliation, the humiliation is on the Tory party sitting behind the Liberal Unionist minister who stands fast by the old Laurier Naval policy, although the time is not opportune to-day to put it into force. The humiliation is on the Tory party, now obliged to accept a policy which they denounced from one end of the country to the other,—denounced in the county of Lambton as being a separatist policy; denounced in the province of Quebec, in my constituency, in the constituency of Beauce, in the constituency of Kamouraska;—in short, in the sixty-five constituencies of my native province as being too British. Sir, what are the facts? When in 1910, the Naval Bill was about to be read a third time, a gentleman rose from his seat and moved this amendment:

[Mr. Lemieux.]

Mr. Speaker, in amendment to the motion that the Bill be now read the second time, I move that the word "now" be struck out, and the words be added at the end of the motion "this day six months."

This amendment was moved by Mr. Northrup, who at that time was a member of the House of Commons. The vote was taken on the 10th day of March, 1910. The House divided on Mr. Northrup's amendment, and the first name on the list of nays is the proud name of the hon. member for Lambton, Mr. Armstrong!

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): Will my hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Just allow me one moment, please. I am rather pleased to find that at last there is some sign of repentance on my hon. friend's part for his own action of a few years ago. The hon. member, I have no doubt, now regards his vote when my old chief Sir Wilfrid Laurier, propounded a national policy which is now adopted by the Government and which in 1910 had been endorsed by the Admiralty.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: May I ask a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Can you tell us why the Government of that day did not put that policy into force? And what about the three dreadnought policy?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Chairman, I shall not evade the issue. I have stated that in 1909 the House unanimously voted in favour of the principle of that policy, and in 1910 the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier came before Parliament with a policy based in the resolution of 1909. It was bitterly opposed, I should say scandalously opposed, by the hon. gentlemen. We went to the country in 1911. And we were defeated, in our province especially, by the appeals, yes, the vicious appeals, made by the allies of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But why should I resuscitate the naval debate?

What is the issue? Let me say frankly I do not share the views of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) when he says that Canada should depend on the Monroe doctrine for its protection, because it does not apply to Canada. After all, what is the Monroe doctrine? It is a British doctrine. The Monroe doctrine was invented by Canning, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain after the Treaty of Vienna. It was suggested to the American minister by Canning. For what purpose? Because the Spanish colonies in South America had