

In the third place, there has not been in connection with a single item of the estimates so submitted any request from any government in any other place whatsoever. In the fourth place, parliament itself must be the final judge as to Canada's participation in any future war—

Moreover let me say to the scribbler who signed the foregoing article that there are many more newspapermen of his calibre who take for gospel anything that smacks of criticism against the Liberal regime and who print on the 67th page news of the good deeds performed by a Liberal government. Would anything convince those gentlemen? Would they require the Prime Minister and his colleagues to execute a notarial document in the presence of 150 witnesses to the effect that they will reject all future commitments? As far as I am concerned, I have no reason to question the statements of the Hon. Mr. King and Mr. Lapointe, and I do not believe that our money will be used for a definite militaristic scheme. That question of the defence estimates amounts to a question of quantum. I have heard the speech delivered by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie). Before taking a stand on the advisability of certain items, I reserve the right to ask questions about them, and I hope his answers will sufficiently enlighten me, when the estimates are considered by the committee. And I will give the government, as our English speaking friends would say, a fair trial.

If unfortunately they were to deceive me, an occurrence that I fail to conceive, I would be the first to-morrow to denounce them as forcibly as I am defending them to-day. For, the only reward I can expect from politics is the conviction of having done my duty. I will always continue to work without flinching and without any animosity to preserve the freedom of my race and country; so that our people may live in order and peace; so that the dominion Liberal party may maintain his great traditions, based on a truly Canadian policy.

I am a Liberal, it is true, sir; but above all I am a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian. When I say that I am a Canadian, I mean that I want a truly self-governing Canada freely associated to the British commonwealth of nations. I am a Canadian to the core, I will never give up my sons, when they are old enough to be soldiers, for the sake of defending England or any foreign nation.

My Canadianism might be summed up in these words: nothing on earth will ever induce me to send out of the country these two little French Canadians whom I love more than

anything else in the world so that they may fight for England or France; but I would consider them as cowards if they were not first in the front line of trenches to fight for Canada, for the land they are taught to love as true French Canadians.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the preceding speaker (Mr. Lalonde) will excuse me if I do not follow him in his remarks. Whatever their content may have been, I am quite sure that his speech was delivered in very good style.

Judging from the speeches that have been made in this chamber since the amendment was moved, Mr. Speaker, I think this group can take credit to itself for having given the members of this house an opportunity of expressing their views on the question now before us. Most of the discussion has not been altogether against our point of view. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie), in opening his speech on Monday evening, took strong exception to the form of the amendment. He called it a double-barrelled amendment. Let me read the amendment and see to what extent it is double-barrelled:

This house views with grave concern the startling increases of expenditure proposed by the government for purposes of national armament in contrast with the inadequate provision for the social security of all sections of the Canadian people.

The Minister of National Defence, having read the amendment, immediately referred to a resolution that was proposed in this house in 1933, and then, turning to the members behind him, he made this most peculiar statement, which you will find at page 896 of Hansard:

The hon. member for Vancouver North by his amendment is seeking to obtain power, because the carrying of his amendment would mean the defeat of this government; a socialist government would then be in control in this dominion, and we would have the establishment of a socialist state. That is what the amendment means, and nothing else.

Now, that may be good strategy on the part of the Minister of National Defence, but it is certainly not statesmanship. He may think a thing like that will go over with the province of Quebec, where the people may have been prejudiced against socialism, but let me tell him that it is not going to do for the people of this country generally. All that we do in this amendment is to draw attention to and say that we are opposed to the great increase in the military estimates in comparison with what has been done in regard to social services to meet the needs of