

line. My right honourable friend opposite will perhaps laugh when I repeat a statement I made in another place in 1920, that Canada in case of war would have to depend to a greater or less extent on the Monroe Doctrine.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Never!

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Very good. I do not think there is any need for us to blush or to feel inferior on that account. In my opinion it is more important to the United States than even to ourselves that Canada should never be conquered by a European power. The United States could not afford to allow Canada to be invaded. To prevent this the United States would either invoke the Monroe Doctrine or send cruisers to protect our shores as it did in 1917, after the War started. Naturally, no one objected then. Neither was there objection nor embarrassment when the Japanese Government sent cruisers to protect our Pacific coast. Consequently I do not see why any Canadian should feel humiliated by my suggestion that the Monroe Doctrine may help Canada in case of another war. I am willing that we should go the limit in protecting our own coast-line; but I go further, and in this I am backed up by the Marquess of Lothian. Speaking in the House of Lords recently, he stated:

If one could get an extension of the Monroe Doctrine and a combination of the democracies under the Monroe system with the British Commonwealth sufficiently closely integrated so as to be invulnerable and able to stand outside the vortex of a European war, one would create a centre of stability and peace in the world which might exorcize for ever the spectre of another world war.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: I am glad my right honourable friend approves that statement. So do I.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: But we have not that yet.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: What, the Monroe Doctrine?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No; we have not what is asked for there.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: I know we have not; but is it not something we should pray for?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. If Canada is ever in jeopardy the Old Country will defend us, as she has always done in the past. The Hon. Anthony Eden only the other day said—I do not know whether my honourable friend read the statement in the press—that Great Britain's rearmament programme was for the preservation and maintenance not only

of the United Kingdom, but of the Empire as a whole. I admire my honourable friend opposite very much, but I do not agree with him when he says that if this country is in danger at any time we must take cover under the Monroe Doctrine. I say the British authorities will look after us.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: I am sorry if my honourable friend misunderstood me. I did not say we should take cover under the Monroe Doctrine. I think I am as good a Scotchman as he is—and the Scotchman is proud. I should not want anybody to fight for me, any more than my honourable friend would want anybody to fight for him. But I say that, in the first place, as he must realize, in the event of a European war occurring to-morrow we could not expect the British Navy to protect Canada. It could not do so now any more than it could in 1914, simply because with the vast ramifications of the British Empire it is impossible for Great Britain to protect all her colonies and the self-governing Dominions. What is the use of my honourable friend relying on what the Hon. Anthony Eden or anybody else may say? The British Navy cannot protect Canada. We must protect ourselves. Not only so, but we must rely upon our friendly neighbour; not because that friendly neighbour desires to protect us, but because it must protect us in order to protect itself.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: The United States can never allow a hostile power to come in by the back or side door. The United States' line for defence purposes extends from Grand Manan to Belle Isle on the Atlantic and from the Fraser river to Alaska on the Pacific. It does not end at Cape Flattery and Juan de Fuca strait on the Pacific, nor at Grand Manan and the St. Croix river on the Atlantic. I really do not think that my honourable friend and I are very much in disagreement. I am not saying we should expect anything from the United States which is not our due, but I do say it is not fair to expect the Mother Country to protect us if she is ever involved in another European war and the German Government or the Italian Government or some other belligerent power sends submarines to attack our ports and our mercantile marine. I contend that we should defend ourselves as far as we are able.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Then, if necessary, we should have no hesitation in calling upon, or expecting help from, the United States. We should not be calling upon our neighbour to