

precate the Russian revolution which was brought about by a measure of force we ought also deprecate the revolution in Italy which was brought about by force. If we recognize the government of the latter country, for the life of me I cannot see any reason why we should not recognize the government of the former country. Personally—and I think I am speaking for a very large number of the labour people in Canada—I should like to express endorsement of the action of the government this fall in regard to its action in the Near East trouble. I am sure it was a tremendous relief to a great number of the people of Canada when they found the Premier of this country did not intend to plunge this country into war without the consent of parliament. I want to compliment the Premier on adopting a policy which is, I believe, essentially in line with the very best Liberal traditions. But, on the other hand, I take it that a negative attitude with regard to European affairs cannot very well be maintained. It would seem to me that we must ultimately face the alternative: that either we shall have to develop into what is practically an independent nation, or else we shall have to set up machinery by which we can have an effective voice in the affairs of the British commonwealth. I do not know which way events will drive us, but I think we ought to frankly face that alternative. I for one should like to have seen the government bring before us at this time some policy which would enable us to define more clearly our relationship to the British Empire. The Premier in his speech yesterday dwelt upon the right of parliament to decide this question of parliament being consulted before Canada embarked on war. I agree with him. On the other hand he refuses, at the request of the British government, to place before this House certain correspondence which was said to be confidential. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the people of this country, I claim that I, and the whole body of citizens, have a perfect right to know what negotiations are proceeding between Canada and the United Kingdom. It may be all very true that the present government may say that they will take no step to commit us to war without submitting the matter to parliament, but, on the other hand, we all know that negotiations may be going on steadily, which practically commit the country to war before we reach the final step where parliament is to be consulted. If we really believe in democracy we ought to do away with secret diplomacy in every form.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it his opinion,

inasmuch as the British government have asked that certain cables which they have sent to this government should not be made public, that the government should decline to meet their wishes in that matter?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is for the Premier to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am asking the hon. member if he would kindly give the House his views.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would refuse to allow Canada to continue to be placed in such a position as that. It is impossible that we can continue in that relationship very long, and I think that we ought to insist, as I have said, on the adoption of one or the other alternative, either that of independence, recognizing that we are not in honour bound to do just what Great Britain says or, on the other hand, that machinery should at once be set up which would enable us to have an effective voice in the determination of the policy of the British Empire. Personally, I am afraid of Imperialism. I was reading the other day a book written some twenty years ago by Mr. J. A. Hobson, and I should like to quote one or two excerpts, because I am firmly convinced that whilst we all, I take it, in this House, as true Britishers, should have a profound respect for the Old Land, we recognize that many of the policies that have been given to the world in the name of Great Britain are, in reality, policies of only a very small section of the British people. A very few weeks after the attempt was made to involve this country in this imperial question we find the government was turned out of power, and another government put in its place. Mr. Hobson says:

Imperialism is the endeavour of the controllers of industry to broaden the channel for the flow of the surplus wealth by seeking foreign markets and foreign investments, to take off the goods and capital they cannot sell or use at home. . . . It is not too much to say that the modern foreign policy of Great Britain is primarily a struggle for profitable markets of investment to a larger extent each year. Great Britain is becoming a nation living on tribute from abroad and the classes who enjoy the tribute have an ever increasing incentive to employ the public policy, the public purse, and the public force to extend the field of their private investments.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes, you remember, said rather cynically that "Her Majesty's flag is the greatest commercial asset in the world." Mr. Brailsford, in "The War of Steel and Gold," published before the war, says:

In 1909, as Sir George Paish stated in a paper which he read to the Royal Statistical Society, our profits prove from foreign and colonial investments amounted to \$140,000,000. One no longer inquires why the un-aggressive, anti-militarist, anti-imperialist Liberalism of