

blunder into international conflicts, if Canadian capitalists become involved in aggressive foreign graft; if Canadian militarists succeed in picking a quarrel with their neighbours, no obligation of duty or of honour will rest with the British war office. Canada's quarrel must be just and the issues at stake must be imperial, otherwise it is no affair of the army or navy of Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to look a little further into that matter and to ask what would be the result of the argument advanced by the Prime Minister. If Britain entered into a war which Canada did not consider just, or if forsooth with a navy constructed as it is proposed to be constructed by the government, Canada should undertake a war, and if it is true that Canada would not be affected in the one case or Great Britain in the other. Let us assume for the sake of argument that Britain did enter on a war which in the opinion of the Prime Minister was not a just war, which in the opinion of this government was not a just war, and let us say further that Great Britain was finding difficulty in that war, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would be the position of Canada? Would she stand aloof waiting until the empire had been destroyed, or would she as duty called, arise and go to the rescue of Great Britain? If Canada failed in her duty; if she carried out what I understood to be the policy announced by the leader of the government, and the official organ of the government, she would stand aloof. Let us take as an illustration the South African war. You know how it was only after great pressure that this government was brought to send troops to South Africa to aid the mother country. I do not mean to say for one moment that Great Britain would not have been victorious without the Canadian troops, and further I want to say that great as was the physical aid rendered by the brave soldiers of Canada and the other parts of the empire, and nobly as they did their duty, yet I venture to say that the physical advantage gained from the troops sent by the various colonies was infinitesimal compared with the great moral effect their presence had, not only on the enemy himself, but on the world at large. Why, the speech of the right hon. the first minister reminds me of an extract from an oration by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackenzie King). He was describing one of his many peregrinations on behalf of the country, his trip from Vancouver to Japan, and, I do not quote him verbatim, but only his expression of thought—he said:

As I lay in the luxurious deck chair of a palatial Oriental steamer, watching the smoke curls of my fragrant Havana, I saw in the heavens a great luminous body, and, as I gazed in wonder, the thought came to me 'like winged light' that this was 'the same

old moon' that was watching over the peaceful slumbers of the good citizens of Berlin after a hard day's work in field or factory, in order that they might contribute of their earnings to keep me travelling in foreign countries.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speeches of the first minister and of hon. gentlemen opposite I thought it was the same old moonshine—a great cloud of words to hide the issue. There were no details as to how they proposed to carry out the provisions of the Bill, or how the Bill is going to benefit the empire. Why, when the first minister was asked by a gentleman on this side of the House for some detail, he said: I do not know anything about it, I am only speaking in a general way. And, when a moment later he was asked to give one or two facts in regard to very pertinent matters, the answer of the right hon. gentleman was: Oh, let me alone, I want to finish my speech—I was almost going to say 'work.'

Now, just a word as to the speech of our good friend the Postmaster General. As I listened to his eloquent description of French Canadian history I was reminded of my early school days, but it was evident to me that the Postmaster General had not profited by the admonition of his leader when he said: I think we are getting pretty far away from the question we have on hand just now. I agree with the first minister that the arguments advanced by the Postmaster General were pretty far from the question that we have in hand just now. Why, Sir, he undertook to place on 'Hansard' a list of what he called colonies, but all of which turned out to be independent countries, and if he were advancing any argument at all in regard to them, he was advancing the argument—because he used it in that direction—as to the advantage of an independent navy, and we find that the result of their independent navies was, that they became individual petty states in all these countries, and today, I would ask the Postmaster General to look over the financial record and see the large cost to every one of these states for the maintenance of these navies. And, let me ask: Is there a single state named in the list brought down by the Postmaster General that would for a moment stand today before any of the first-rate powers of the world? I say no, I say such navies would be of little assistance in such a conflict. Further, I find we have the opinion of Professor J. Shield Nicholson, who has written recently in his new book, 'the Project of the Empire':

'The need for effective colonial aid for the maintenance of naval power is,' he says, 'urgent and pressing; it cannot be met by promises which will require a long period for their fulfilment; nor merely by the adoption of means designed to advance the general