

or declare war. I need not quote the other attributes, but amongst them is this, that a sovereign country can legislate for its subjects whether they be within her own domain or whether they be in other countries; a sovereign country can legislate for its ships whether they be on the high seas or in their home ports. There was one such country represented at the council table, and that country was Great Britain; the rest were dominions. If we are to believe the report which was tabled in this House, something has happened; each is equal to the other, and none is subordinate in any respect. One thing or the other must have happened; either Great Britain has ceased to be a sovereign country and has descended to the level of a dominion, or each dominion has become a sovereign country. I dismiss the first proposition as absurd; I believe this House would consider it absurd that Great Britain should descend to the level of a dominion. If on the other hand Canada has become a sovereign country, I am going to put to hon. members opposite just one plain proposition in order to test that out. If Canada is a sovereign country she can legislate for her subjects whether they be within or without her borders; she can legislate for her ships whether they be on the high seas or in their home ports. If I mistake not, the right hon. Prime Minister, during the hectic last days of the last session and during the resulting campaign, stated that it was the desire of his government, or his party, to suppress the smuggling traffic in this dominion. If that desire was genuine, Mr. Speaker, and if that report means anything, then the Prime Minister has his opportunity. Those interested in the enforcement of the law say the reason why smuggling is so difficult to suppress is that they cannot go outside the three mile limit to seize and search ships. If this report means anything then I shall expect the government, in order to test it out, to introduce legislation enabling them to seize Canadian ships whether they be inside or outside the three mile limit. If they do not do so, there are only two conclusions one can draw. The first is that the government was not sincere in its statement that it desired to suppress smuggling; the other is that it has not the power and Canada is not a sovereign country. As a matter of fact, I believe that if they did pass such a law—and I present my opinion for what it is worth—it would be held ultra vires by every court of competent jurisdiction in this country. Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the report, in so far as that statement is concerned, is nothing but an empty platitude. Canada acquired her status, not through the efforts of

her politicians, but through the efforts of the 500,000 men who went overseas between the years 1914 and 1918. Fifty thousand of them sleep on foreign soil, and he who says that Canada's status is due to the efforts of her politicians is trying to filch honour from the dead.

I pass now to the subject on which I propose to dwell during most of the time I hope to occupy the attention of the House; that is, the question of maritime rights. The campaign started in 1920, in the province of Nova Scotia, and bore its first fruits when the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Black) was elected in the by-election of 1923. In the course of his remarks yesterday, the Prime Minister sought to take unto his government credit for the fact that it was his government which had appointed the commission headed by Sir Andrew Rae Duncan. May I point out that the senior member for Halifax was the first to mention the question of maritime rights in this House. At that time Nova Scotia was represented by fifteen Liberal members, and each of these members said that the statements of the senior member for Halifax were absurd, and had no truth in them. May I further point out that in the general elections of 1925 the maritime provinces, out of a total representation of thirty, returned twenty-four members pledged to the cause of maritime rights. The speech from the throne, it is true, contained a reference to the appointment of the commission, but I venture to say that it was not any desire on the part of the Prime Minister to have the subject investigated, but rather the voice of the people of the maritime provinces which compelled him to do so. Further, when he states that the maritime members opposed the appointment of the commission, he overlooks the fact that the maritime members stated that they knew what was wrong with the maritime provinces, and had come here to get legislation to remedy those wrongs. He refused to believe them; he stated they did not know, and asked, "What are your maritime rights?" He appointed that commission; he has his answer, and that answer is a complete vindication of those members who sat here last year representing the maritimes.

I purpose dealing briefly with some of the main provisions of that report. The hon. leader of the United Farmers of Alberta (Mr. Gardiner) in the course of his remarks this afternoon said that before we legislated for the maritimes we ought to be sure that we knew what we were doing, and then do all that needed to be done at once. May I point