

Canadian people in Parliament assembled and before our delegates are duly instructed as to that policy. Mr. Chairman, I, after listening to the debate of this evening—although of another lineage than my hon. friend, although different blood courses through my veins, I think, yes indeed I believe, that I hold better British traditions than does my hon. friend. If there is one thing that the Mother Country will respect it is the spirit of self assertion, the spirit of independence—moral independence—which actuates the different units of the British Empire at large. This is not a new theory; it is almost a truism according to English parliamentary traditions. Listen to the words of the great parliamentarian Edmund Burke—perhaps the greatest of all British parliamentarians, certainly the most brilliant of the eighteenth century. Speaking on a question where the equality of freedom and self-government of a British dominion was the main topic, he used the following words:

My hold of the colonies is in the close affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, from similar privileges and equal protection. These are ties which, though light as air, are strong as links of iron. . . . As long as you have the wisdom to keep the sovereign authority of this country as the sanctuary of liberty, the sacred temple consecrated to our common faith, wherever the chosen race and sons of England worship freedom, they will turn their faces towards you. The more they multiply, the more friends you will have; the more ardently they love liberty; the more perfect will be their obedience. Deny this participation of freedom, and you break the sole bond, which originally made, and must still preserve, the unity of the Empire. . . . It is the spirit of the English constitution, which, infused through the mighty mass, pervades, feeds, invigorates, vivifies, every part of the Empire, even down to the minutest member.

I am bold to say, Mr. Chairman, that a Canadian can be a good Britisher—and it is my case—without being a jingo or a blatant Imperialist. Militarism is the natural consequence of Imperialism. I believe in the British Empire because it is not founded on militarism; it is founded on freedom, on justice, and on liberty. The difference between the British Empire and the other empires that have failed and disappeared is that it has granted her overseas Dominions full autonomy, while the Roman Empire exacted from its colonies that serfage which brought it to destruction; and the French Empire of Napoleon went to ruin from the same cause.

Speaking of Napoleon, Mr. Chairman, he begun as a soldier of the revolution. Bonaparte was at first a friend of freedom, and the armies which he led were carried away

by the immortal La Marseillaise. They sang that inspiring chant which has since thrilled the hearts of all liberty lovers in the world.

Allons, enfants de la patrie,
Le jour de gloire est arrivé!

That was the song of liberty, a liberty which the French armies promised to the downtrodden people of Europe, but under the mastery form of Emperor Napoleon liberty gave place to an acute imperialism which finally became an acute militarism, and it brought about his downfall.

Sir, our soldier boys did not fight and die on the plains of Flanders to erect on the ruins of German militarism a new form of imperialism. They fought and died for freedom, for the establishment of peace in the world; and we cannot erect a nobler monument to their memory than the League of Nations. That is the monument of our noble dead. The time is past when you could lure and thrill the masses by singing:

Le jour de gloire est arrivé

No.

L'ère de paix est arrivée

A new world is born, an era of peace has risen, and let us hope it has come to stay.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, the debate this evening has shown pretty conclusively that the difference between hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and hon. gentlemen opposite is that we on this side take some pride in the circumstance that in 1910 the Government of the day passed the Act which is known as the Canadian Naval Service Act, in which was set out the policy of the Liberal party in regard to naval matters. From that day until the present, the Liberal party have been staunch advocates of a Canadian naval service; that is the policy which we think should be the permanent policy of this country. But, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, we have had from the minister himself this evening—in fact, we have had it each time he has spoken on naval matters this year—the admission that the Government have no permanent naval policy whatever; and yet they come before this Parliament and ask a vote for naval expenditure.

The ordinary course of procedure is, first of all, to have a policy, then to expound and explain it, then to bring in the legislation based upon it, and ask for appropriations to put that policy into effect. But the Government of the day is reversing the usual