

that source a portion of the necessary revenue. If ever there was an example of a man straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel, the member for Pictou was such an example this afternoon—and I never knew him to strain more strenuously or swallow more successfully.

Is the munitions industry, my hon. friend says, to become extinct in this country? If he wants a straight answer to that question, I say, yes: I hope it is to become extinct; I hope that it will become extinct very quickly by the conclusion of this monstrous war which has made the manufacture of munitions in Canada necessary for so long a period. Can we contemplate the end of the war and yet make the demand that the same explosives shall be manufactured, the same munitions ordered, the same tremendous expense incurred as hitherto? These are the engines of war; they are destructive from A to Z, and when they cease because war ceases, a feeling of relief will be experienced in all parts of the world. The argument of the member for Pictou was that you must keep the war going for the sake of keeping up the manufacture of munitions in Canada, and of employing labour and capital and securing profits. Is Canada, the member for Pictou says, to have her hands tied in the manufacture of munitions? Why, he asks, should capital invested in the manufacture of munitions be struck down? Again I press my point against my hon. friend's argument. It is a vicious argument which, pressed to its logical conclusion, is nothing more or less than this: Do not restrict the output of munitions; do not strike down capital; do not restrain wages; keep up the war in order to keep all those things going. No other logical conclusion can be drawn from his argument.

I now come to the argument of the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). He, too, is deeply interested in the keeping up of the manufacture of munitions at the old rate in Canada. He, however, falls foul of the chief reasons given by the member for Pictou for his contentions. He (Mr. Pugsley) says that if he had his way he would have these manufactures of munitions so carried out by the Government that there would be no profits. Therefore the argument of the member for Pictou, as to keeping up the manufacture of munitions so that revenue may be obtained from the profits, falls to the ground. The two hon. gentlemen are not in agreement.

In all frankness and candour, what does the member for St. John mean? What does he argue for? What does he insist upon?

[Sir George Foster.]

He says that Great Britain should continue to buy munitions in Canada and we to manufacture them. Let me once more revert to his intimation that while the manufacture of munitions is being restricted to a certain extent in Canada, shells are being purchased by Great Britain in the United States. This is absolutely not the fact. I have stated that before, there is no need of my reiterating it; I gave the information to the member for Welland (Mr. German). But here is the important thing: Why, the hon. gentleman asks, does Great Britain restrict or discontinue the manufacture of munitions in Canada? A straight answer to that is this: Because she is now able to supply in her own country all that she needs. Does my hon. friend argue that if Great Britain needs numberless and tremendously expensive supplies, she shall continue to obtain outside of her own territory what she can make to excess within her own borders? That is exactly what my hon. friend's argument amounts to. To demand that is to make a vicious demand, one not in the interests of Canada or of the Empire; one not in the interests of the war or of the conclusion of peace.

Does my hon. friend seriously argue that, because we in Canada would get wages and find employment by Great Britain coming here for munitions in excess of what she can make in her own country, therefore we ought selfishly to ask her to make that sacrifice and she ought to make that sacrifice in order that we might have that employment and those wages? Canada does not take that position. I am willing to leave that position to my hon. friend from St. John. There are things that Great Britain cannot produce in her own country and that we can produce in Canada, and there is peril to-day that Great Britain, owing to her financial position, will not be able to purchase from Canada what she absolutely needs of the beneficent production of this country. Yet my hon. friend from St. John would have this Government insist upon the British Government spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this country for munitions which can be made in Britain, to the detriment of the purchase in this country of the agricultural products which we can raise and which Great Britain cannot raise. There is no ground for such an argument as that or for insisting upon it. So far as this Government is concerned, we do not intend to insist upon that thing being done. We do not intend to take the vicious ground of demanding that Great