

is a moral game, then it would be done for the moral effect. In effect, to back up a bluff, was what Canada was asked to do, and I should be very sorry if it ever was in the history or nature of this people to become bluffers, to become rattlers of the sabre, and in a great crisis to take that kind of attitude that would be brow-beating and boastful. I would rather that Canada were a nation that does not say too much, but that acts right up to what it says and does it. That is what the people of the nation after which we claim to model our institutions, to a great extent are limited for—not saying more than they will do, but thoroughly doing that which they say. That was the attitude of the Prime Minister of this country at that time, and we have every reason to be proud of him that he acted in the good old traditional way in which we would expect a Canadian government to act. It is not always hasty action, the showing of alacrity, that is the wisest course. There is an expression that came to me often in 1914 when I thought of the great crisis and how much was in the balance, when I thought how deliberately Britain took the stand that she did. I would apply those same words to Canada in September last and through her future history, and I hope it will always be the idea that will govern her statesmen. The words are these:

Rightly to be great
Is not to stir without great argument,
But greatly to find quarrel in a straw
When honour's at the stake.

Was honour at the stake? Our government did not stir without great argument. They did not see the argument in the matter, and they did not stir; but had honour been at stake, I feel sure they would have taken those steps that would have been necessary to protect the honour of this country. No, there was a reversal of policy. Almost immediately that those few drops of cold modesty were sprinkled upon the ardour of the British ministers, their policy was reversed, and newspapers came out in England applauding Canada for the stand she had taken. Resolutions were passed by city councils and other bodies, congratulating this Dominion that she was able to take the wise stand that she did. The election came off, and hon. gentlemen know what happened. That policy was reversed by a majority in that election, and that showed that the people did not back up the gentleman who was then Prime Minister of England, nor the gentleman who sent the message.

When the gentleman who sent the message, who was known, I believe, as I said, as a
[Mr. Raymond.]

Hotspur, to be of an impetuous nature, and who wished to play this game of bluff in the East, went north to his constituents in Scotland, why, Sir, he was beaten. The people showed him that they did not approve his policy.

An hon. MEMBER: By a prohibitionist.

Mr. RAYMOND: That is just what I was going to say. It is bad enough to be beaten at any time; but when hon. members consider the bitter irony of the position of being beaten in Scotland by a prohibitionist, they will realise the strength of feeling that was in the hearts of those voters must have been much more than usual. I consider the fact that these incidents were not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne was rather a good thing than a bad one. Why should these incidents have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne? If you are going across the Atlantic and you pass a dangerous rock or reef, and if the captain or the pilot were to point it out to you and say: "We passed that rock safely," you would think he was looking for credit for passing it. Had this matter been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we would have had the criticism that the government was looking for credit for having saved the country from the dire calamity of war, the most dire calamity that could have befallen it. The government did not mention it in the Speech from the Throne, not desiring to have that criticism, and hence its absence is commented upon. I think it is a good thing that no reference is made to it. It was an event that sank deeply into the hearts of all the Canadian people. It was one of the events that will help to make and mould the public mind of this country, so that whenever the eventuality faces us, whether we shall be at war or at peace, those who are rulers at the time when this may happen, will consider the matter so carefully that they will not stir without great argument; that they will form their decision very resolutely, carefully and wisely; that they will count all the costs; that they will count the cost in money.

There is no one who will not admit that even the enormous sum that the war cost us was very little indeed to what it cost Canada in other respects. We cannot forget those graves which you, Mr. Speaker, went over to visit last summer; and he who would commit this country to war at any time must do it so that he can look the widow and the orphan in the face afterwards. The Prime Minister did not feel that he could do so last September,