

suggestion. Then we had the Naval Service Act of this country. What did it mean? It was sufficient to meet the wishes of the people of Canada at that time. Without any bitterness—for there is no bitterness in my heart—I would ask the honourable senator from Alma (Hon. Mr. Ballantyne) did he vote for that. I would ask the honourable senator from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach) did he vote for it. I would ask the honourable senator from South Toronto (Hon. Mr. Macdonell) did he vote for it. Far from it. What did they and their friends do?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would the honourable member allow me to say that I was not a member of the House at that time? I had the honour to be a member of the Liberal party then, and was fully in accord with the Laurier naval policy.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: So much the worse for the honourable gentleman. After the Laurier bill of 1910 became law, a piece of legislation was introduced in the House of Commons on the 26th of January, 1911, by one of the greatest men Canada ever knew, the Hon. W. S. Fielding. I was sitting not far from him at the time. Now I am coming close to my honourable friend. He says that he was not a member of the House then. I am quite well aware that he was not a member until 1917; but in 1911 he was a power in the city of Montreal and in the province of Quebec. Did he support the "Old Knight" in 1911? No. He lined up with the Gordons, the Holts, the Flavelles and the Siftons; he went into league with the Monks, the Laverignes and the Bourassas, to destroy the greatest man and greatest public character Canada has ever known.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would my honourable friend, for whom I have the greatest respect, allow me a word? I differed with my old friend Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the question of reciprocity alone. I did not differ with him on the naval policy, and I took no part whatsoever in the 1911 election.

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY: I accept my honourable friend's word in toto when he says that he was in accord with Sir Wilfrid on the naval policy. But there is an old saying that silence is golden. By his silence the honourable gentleman won away support from Sir Wilfrid Laurier and helped to bring about the defeat of the naval policy and the reciprocity proposal as well.

To-day we have in this country and in this House woe and lamentation. Who was it who said, "There will be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth; there will be weeping

Hon. Mr. MOLLOY.

and wailing and snatching of beef"? To-day there is no beef, or very little, for the Imperialists in Canada: the Nationalists ate it all in 1911. To-day we have no navy in this country. My honourable friend from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Macdonell) in closing his speech said the position of the Canadian people was a disgrace. Very well; if it is, the stigma cannot be attached to members who sit on this side of the House and who were in favour of the naval policy of 1911. It would be a good thing for Canada to-day if we had what was branded in the province of Ontario as the "tin pot navy of the Laurier Government." Are these facts or are they not? I say they are facts and cannot be denied.

The matter I am dealing with is not ancient history; it is recent history; and I do not intend to detain the House with it for very long, because, as I have said, I had not intended taking part in this debate at all. A few moments ago I mentioned the speech of the honourable senator from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach). To certain aspects of that speech I take great objection. He spoke of neutrality. He said that if Britain was at war it followed in the natural course of events that Canada would be at war. That I absolutely deny. Whether or not Canada is at war will depend on the circumstances I mentioned a few moments ago. If Britain sees fit at any time to take part in a war in which we, as Canadians, have no interest, so far as I am concerned Britain will have to fight it out alone. That is where I stand. If we are to continue doing as we have done in the past, what is going to happen us? The World War was declared in 1914. This is 1937. If a European war were to break out to-morrow—I do not care who would be to blame; indeed, all would be to blame, because it takes more than one to make a quarrel—should we be bound, right or wrong, to take part in that war because we happen to belong to the British Commonwealth of Nations? I say no. Further, I believe the Canadian people have made up their minds that they are not going to do it. We had one experience, a pretty bitter one. I mentioned a while ago the number of Canadians who enlisted, the number who went overseas, the number wounded and the number killed. It was a mighty costly business in life and money. My information is that up to the present time the war and its aftermath have cost this small nation \$4,500,000,000.

At this session of Parliament there was introduced by the Government a Bill for the defence of Canada, to which Bill some objection was taken not only by members of a party in opposition, but also by members