

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, he did not.

Mr. BENNETT: That is what he said.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He did not.

Mr. BENNETT: All right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He himself has stated specifically to me that what he did he did entirely on his own responsibility.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I gave him no encouragement or authority, nor has he had any from any federal source so far as the Yukon road is concerned. When the question comes up for consideration by this government, this government will give its answer with respect to what is to be done.

Mr. McGEER: Do I understand from the leader of the opposition that he is opposed to the construction of the Alaska highway?

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly he is.

Mr. McGEER: I am glad to know that.

Mr. BENNETT: Certainly he is, under the conditions suggested, because the back door is as open as the front door. Always keep that in mind, and I have said so frequently. There is nothing new about it. This morning we have the Minister of National Defence leaving it to the Prime Minister to make the statement he has made, and it is the same Minister of National Defence who has told this country that it is on the British navy that we are going to depend, plus the American navy on the Pacific. There is his speech; I read from it again the other day. He did not say that we were going to have the American navy for sure, but that he felt as a matter of friendliness that they would probably see us out of our difficulties.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I never mentioned the word American.

Mr. BENNETT: He mentioned the word neighbour.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): But not the word American.

Mr. BENNETT: Well, he did not mean Mexico as far as I know. Now I will put one point and leave it at that. If it is essential that we should depend upon the British navy for our national life, is it inconsistent with our position of free association with the people who provide it that they should have an opportunity to establish a training school in Canada for those who will defend, not their country, but our common heritage with their navy upon which we depend, according to the minister himself? Everybody, I think, will agree with

[Mr. Bennett.]

that, and I believe that the great mass of public opinion in this country would support that view.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Would my right hon. friend extend that principle even to the land forces, the militia—to have the militia of the United Kingdom use Canada as a crown colony for training purposes?

Mr. BENNETT: No sir.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Well, what is the difference?

Mr. BENNETT: I made it clear at the threshold of my observations that aerial attack and defence are entirely different from other warlike operations. We are dealing with operations in the air. It has never been suggested that England should undertake defensive or offensive operations in Canada, but to train their airmen where they would be free from attack, that they might protect that navy on which we depend, that navy which is to save us and our harbours and our trade and commerce east and west. The training for air service is different from that for the navy and army. I would not for a moment suggest that the militia of England or the army of England should train here. Far from it.

Mr. VIEN: The principle is the same.

Mr. BENNETT: It is not the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is exactly the same.

Mr. BENNETT: It is quite different, carrying into the air bombs with flying machines and training men to meet an enemy at our gate and to defend the navy that preserves from destruction our commerce on the open seas is quite unlike military operations. There is no similarity in the world.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say one word in conclusion. There is not a man in this parliament who believes more strongly in the British Empire and the part it is playing in the world to-day than myself. I believe that the British Empire can be kept together and made an effective instrument for peace throughout the world by effective cooperation between the self-governing dominions and the United Kingdom. But I do say that any reversal of the trend, of which we are all fully cognizant, that has taken place in the last century with respect to military establishments, whether they relate to the army or the air or to the naval service, would be a factor in dismembering the British Empire and would create all sorts of controversy and discussion in the country, serving no useful