

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the remarks by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr arose from the great latitude that was given to the hon. member who now has the floor. I must ask hon. members to stick to the rule, which says that we must address ourselves to the item before the committee.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Then I submit, Mr. Chairman, that you drew the line at the wrong time. You should have stopped the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr.

The CHAIRMAN: I would wish to adhere to the rules at all times, but by the unanimous consent of the committee on many occasions some latitude must be given. But the chairman must draw the line somewhere.

Mr. JAKES: Well, Mr. Chairman, this item deals with the League of Nations, and surely the League of Nations deals with political philosophy. If it does not, it does not deal with anything. I only want to make a remark on a certain political philosophy, and it is this, that the views that Mr. L. D. Byrne holds are the opposite of those attributed to him by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr. He has never said and never written that he believed that power must be from the top down. The exact opposite is true. We hold and preach, and have preached for years, that it is the privilege of the people to decide policy, to demand results; it is the duty of their government to obtain those results for them, if that government is a democratic government. It should obtain those results by instructing the necessary experts to bring them about. That I say is the exact opposite of the ideas attributed to Mr. Byrne by the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Just a word regarding this collective security. I think we could find in *Hansard* several occasions on which I have taken strong issue with those who were dreaming of the impossible ideal of collective security. In 1936 and 1937 we trusted ourselves to collective security, and the result is that we fell into a state of unpreparedness which allowed aggression to raise its frightful head and put us in danger of being swept from the earth. Right in the presence of disaster we have men rise in this house and talk of collective security. I am amazed. If the British empire and individual members of the British commonwealth of nations and the United States had depended upon themselves and made their walls strong and not bothered about collective security, depending upon people who were utterly undependable, we should not to-day be in grave danger of being destroyed as an empire. I say, what has been throbbing in my being ever since I came to

[Mr. Jakes.]

this house, that we as Anglo-Saxon people and the peoples associated with us in our government must look to ourselves and the God who guides us for our defence and strength in this world; we must not depend on other nations; we cannot depend on them; they will fail us in our hour of need. It is well enough to be ready to cooperate with other nations, well enough to get all the help we can from them. But we have failed, dreadfully once; let us never in the long history which awaits us fail again.

Item agreed to.

Canada's contribution to maintenance of existing organizations.

44. Portion of expenditure of the imperial economic committee and the imperial shipping committee, \$4,675.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I should like an explanation as to the division of that amount between the imperial economic committee and the imperial shipping committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These are two committees which have been established for many years by the empire governments, all of which make a contribution towards their work. The governments of the empire accepted the recommendations of the imperial committee on economic consultation and cooperation that the dominions should share the financial responsibility of the joint services to be carried on, instead of leaving it to be borne wholly by the United Kingdom. The cost of the imperial economic committee is met by a fund to which the participating governments contribute on a scale recommended by the imperial committee on economic consultation and cooperation in 1933. This fund since October 1, 1933, has been £20,200 a year. The imperial economic committee in the financial statement and forecast for the period April 1, 1938, to March 31, 1943, foresaw that the work at present in view would make it desirable to increase the fund to £22,000 a year. The imperial economic committee portion is £22,000, the imperial shipping committee £2,000; total £24,000. Canada's share on the scale recommended in the report is £3,840. In 1940-41 we were asked to make provision for 50 per cent of our normal contribution, and the amount submitted for 1941-42 is 25 per cent of the original amount.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Has the imperial shipping committee to do with the registry of ships under British or Canadian registry? What is its function?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is an advisory committee on questions of shipping policy; it has not to do with registration.

Item agreed to.