

were put in a negative form. For instance, he stated that should a conflict arise between England and some other major power, he did not think Canada should send munitions and war materials to England's foe. His meaning, as I understood it, was that in a case of that kind we should not necessarily sacrifice on the bloody altar of war the last dollar and the last man in Canada for the sake of the so-called salvation of other countries, but should help in any possible way without impairing the credit of our country for centuries to come; help, for example, by concentrating on the supply of war materials to friends rather than to foes, by producing wheat and other foods for nations with which we have links of sympathy, official and traditional. It seems to me my right honourable friend would have been truer to himself by drawing more generous conclusions from the remarks of the honourable gentleman from Inkerman.

I particularly appreciated the apt and spirited reply which was made to the right honourable leader opposite by my honourable leader on this side (Hon. Mr. Dandurand). He quoted a view expressed on the floor of this House three sessions ago by one of the first lieutenants of the Government of that day, a gentleman who in 1930 was chief organizer of the party which is not mine, a gentleman who is not only a very distinguished citizen of our country, but holds a high military rank. That gentleman is our good friend the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae), and I am going to quote from the speech he delivered to this House on the first of February, 1934, when he made the statement referred to by my honourable leader. I think that, coming from the lips of a man of his standing, these words possess much more interest than they otherwise would:

I am giving my considered, definite opinion when I say that I cannot conceive of any developments which would justify this country in sacrificing the blood of one single Canadian on the future battle-fields of Europe.

If my memory serves me right, the honourable gentleman went further in another case when he stated emphatically he would go to the extent of raising an army himself to oppose the organization of a Canadian army to be sent abroad. That was the most forceful statement of the kind I ever heard from the lips of a Canadian statesman, and it seems to me to be all the more forceful coming from a man of the political stamp of my honourable friend from Vancouver. Nobody, surely, can question his loyalty, even though he made such a statement.

I think something very important was lost sight of throughout the debate yesterday—the truly Canadian viewpoint. We are wit-

nessing again what I may term a Marathon of flag-waving and we are hearing all kinds of protestations about British loyalty, until it would seem that by some mysterious authority we in this House are barred from using the word "Canada." A good deal was said yesterday about the British Empire and the great European powers, but nobody seemed to dare even to whisper the name of our own country. I am proud to declare myself a loyal subject of His Britannic Majesty King George VI, who, though King of Canada, happens to live in another land owing to circumstances which we all appreciate, but who since the enactment of the Statute of Westminster is represented in this Dominion by His Excellency the Governor General. But with equal pride I declare myself a citizen of Canada, a country of glorious traditions, high ambitions, unbounded hope. I am proud to declare myself a loyal and faithful citizen of this great Dominion, the homeland whose soil will nourish my children in life and embrace their mortal remains when they answer the last call. I fully expected yesterday some honourable members would have preferred to talk a little more about Canada and a little less about the rest of the world.

I think, honourable members, it would be not only unfair but dangerous on our part not to listen to the voice of public opinion—and God knows how vehemently it sounds to-day in objection to our participation in foreign wars! Let any honourable member ask the first veteran he may meet on the streets of Ottawa, or of any other city in Canada, whether he would like to see his son go through the furnace and the hell which he himself endured twenty years ago, and attend to his reply. Let him ask the same question of the student bodies of our various universities. Let him ask the editor of *Varsity*, the official publication of the University of Toronto—the very city in which my right honourable friend lives. I have an apposite quotation which I should like to give to the House, but it is too lengthy to quote.

I wish, in passing, to mention a subject which so far has not even been alluded to in this debate, a subject which was dealt with at considerable length last session on the motion of my honourable friend from Rigaud, the ex-Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Sauvé). I refer to immigration en masse and unregulated. At the present time there seems to have been started, let us say for the sake of argument, coincidentally in London in the East and in the vicinity of Lethbridge in the West, an agitation for unrestricted immigration. The parties interested would persuade us that if we adopted their program it would