

submarines and bombers in the vicinity of Irish ports on the west and northwest coasts of Ireland. We are spending, I say, a considerable part of this vote for the maintenance of a sort of embassy in what is not a British dominion but a separate republic, and a neutral. Why should we spend money over there, while Britain has her hands tied behind her back by the loss of the use of these bases, and shipping and tonnage are being sent to the bottom of the sea? Many ships of the merchant marine have been sunk, our brave sailors drowned, and altogether our shipping faces a grave menace. We should close our embassy in Eire, in protest. It is not in the public interest that we should spend money in a neutral country which is not a British dominion, but doing Hitler's work, and the lights of Dublin and other cities enable Hitler to attack Wales and England.

Further, I believe that we should have a change here with regard to the Vichy government. Let us follow Britain in this matter. We cannot blow hot and cold in these matters. No one knows how many ships of Canadian and British register have been ruined in consequence of lack of proper protection by the right to use these ports in this war, ports which in the war with Napoleon caused damage at the back-door.

Coming to the United States, in connection with this particular vote, which is a large one, I would point out that for nearly two years we have been able to get along without a permanent representative there—almost since the war started. It was a great mistake to open that embassy, because it led to considerable friction between the mother country and the United States before and after the last war. We appreciate all that the people of the United States and their splendid president have done for us, but we must not rely to too great an extent on others. It is safer to rely on ourselves. We must not forget that a year ago we depended upon France and the Maginot line. Everyone said that the Maginot line would hold until Britain and the dominions were prepared, and it failed. We are now depending on the United States for protection this year, as on France last year. I suggest that it would be better for us to depend more on the mother country and on the dominions in the present battle of Britain, both in the old country and in the Mediterranean as help from America may come too late. Mr. Knudsen shocked congress by telling them that it would take two years to get munitions and two years to train men, and in the meantime the war is becoming a grave menace to the empire. No one knows to whom this country will belong even at the end of this year.

I have great respect and admiration for the people of the United States; my respect for them is second to that of no one in this house. At the same time I believe in the policy laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald when he said, speaking in 1844 at a nomination meeting in the city of Kingston, that the present and the future of the people of Canada should always be wrapped up in the mother country, and our maintenance of the British connection forever.

I have been opposed to the policy of giving away air bases. I fail to see why air bases should have been given away from Newfoundland all the way down to British Guiana, bases which the United States have wanted for a hundred years and only got when they found the empire in peril. This move would not have been needed had not the finest army, navy and air force been scrapped in order to please pacifists and those who believe in collective security. An armed Britain would have prevented war. The giving away of these bases has been very much opposed in Britain. Some say that it was done at the suggestion of Canada. If so, then I say that Canada acted with very poor judgment in urging that it should be done; because, after all, the Channel islands and Somaliland have been ceded, and now all the bases from Newfoundland, the key to the St. Lawrence, right down to the gulf of Mexico have been handed over under a ninety-nine year lease—practically a freehold—in exchange for fifty obsolete ships and some munitions up to now paid for on the cash-and-carry plan.

This particular policy will in the end drive Britain out of the western hemisphere in a hundred years, and I am opposed to it as a policy of handing over to the United States parts of our empire to pay for tools. It is not in the interests of the people either of Canada or of the empire at large, and I submit that it has come about as the result of our having separate embassies, and of scrapping the finest army, navy and air force the world ever had, to please the pacifists.

With regard to Rhodes scholars, I have nothing to say against them. In fact, I know most of those from the Canadian universities and I am sure they are good men. But Cecil Rhodes did not intend that the principles which some of them advocate should ever be applied to the empire or expect to see the day when such a separatist drift would start. In my opinion, some politicians sent by us as ambassadors have caused harm in connection with these foreign legations of ours. They do not understand anything about diplomacy and have had no training. A good diplomat never makes speeches but works hard. He sticks to his work like the great men I have named.