

the Prime Minister must have taken cognizance of the matter—to find the following statement published by the Canadian press:

B.C. System of Defence Forms Big Triangle of Fortifications.

Anti-aircraft Guns to Be Placed at Albert Head and on Island Highway.

According to unofficial sources these undertakings may include:

1. Naval guns on the south coast near Victoria.

2. Anti-aircraft guns, magazines and other buildings at Albert Head, a few miles from the Esquimalt naval base.

3. Anti-aircraft emplacements about six miles from Victoria on the Island Highway, on the breakwater outside Victoria harbour, and at Trial Island on the Vancouver Island coast.

Then follows a description of the size of the guns. The closing paragraph reads:

Two six-inch naval guns will be set up at Ferguson Point, commanding the narrow entrance to Burrard Inlet (Vancouver harbour). Unofficial sources say similar emplacements will be established also on Point Grey headland, commanding the entrance to English Bay, which skirts urban Vancouver.

It is perfectly clear that this statement came from the department in some way.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Not from headquarters, I can assure the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT: I said, from the department in some way.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): As a matter of fact the statement is not accurate.

Mr. BENNETT: But I know that, unfortunately, part of it is accurate. Here is publication to the world of the defences that are being made by Canada on the Pacific coast, and I am certain, from what I know, that this will be cabled at least to Japan. I do say that in the interests of this country and as a matter of fair play with the permanent force, the members of which are vitally concerned—because it is a reflection upon themselves—an investigation should be held and responsibility brought home to the man who gave out that information. I am perfectly certain that if the Prime Minister were over here and I were in his position he would demand that an investigation should be had, because in the eyes of soldiers in this country this is one of the worst possible offences. I have heard men express the utmost wonder and amazement that it could happen; for the Canadian Press is a responsible organization. There would be no difficulty, if a proper investigation were held, in having it disclosed from what source that information came, and the man who gave it should no longer receive a cent of public

money. I believe the Prime Minister would agree with me—and I am saying this not acrimoniously, but only as a citizen of the country with, I believe, the same interest that everyone else has in the maintenance of those defensive works on the Pacific coast. I merely direct attention to the matter in the hope that the government will announce that they have taken steps to have it thoroughly investigated by a properly constituted tribunal so that the person who gave out the information may be punished, at least to the extent of not being retained in the public service of Canada. I do not think that is too strong a statement, having regard to the seriousness of what is involved.

I am quite aware that the article is so worded as to leave it open to several constructions at some points, and that doubtless some part of it is inaccurate. But it was the subject of editorial comment in the coast papers and has been much discussed throughout the country. Under these circumstances, and having the imprimatur, at least, of the Canadian Press as authority for the statements that have been made—because we know how careful they are not to give, shall I say, publicity to a statement that has not behind it some authority from some source—this news item, I suggest, should be the subject of an investigation, and I think the minister would be well advised to see that a court of inquiry is set up without delay in order that the matter may be dealt with.

This enables me to make an observation with respect to a matter that was brought up this afternoon by the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Warren). He suggests that wars result from restrictions of trade. The exact opposite is the case. The most eminent economists are of the opinion that free trade is always responsible for that class of warfare.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes; and if hon. members will think for a moment they will see the reason why. With free, unhampered competition the struggle for markets becomes notorious and open, with resultant difficulties. It can be said of every war of recent years that it was not engaged in by countries that followed protection as a policy. Take the great Russo-Turkish war in which England and France participated. That was in the days of free trade in England. The Boer war was a domestic war to which we need not refer in this connection. The Franco-Prussian war could not be said to have been a war arising out of tariffs, nor could that be said of the Danish war or the Austrian war. I