

Jay, with the result that in my section of the country a different feeling exists in regard to war profiteers. The Canadian people expect that if we must go to war all the resources of the country will be employed in the prosecution of that war. I believe that in the nation's interest we should conscript, if that is the proper word—perhaps it is not; some people object to it—the resources of the fields, of the forests and of the mines, and all the accumulated wealth.

May I repeat that I am supporting the government in these expenditures, which I believe, involve an increase this year of \$11,615,000. The very amount is alarming, but under existing conditions I feel that as a good Canadian I can take no other course than that of supporting the action of the government.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, certain erroneous statements published in a press with interested motives claiming, without any proof in support of such allegations, that the dominion parliament would vote this year \$70,000,000 towards national defence, have caused great commotion among the public. It is obvious that if the Tories had been in power, probably these statements would have been true, but, thank God, we have in this country a Liberal government headed by the right hon. Mackenzie King, the prime minister "par excellence" and the one who stands in the history of Canada as the less imperialistic of all our prime ministers.

I leave to these comedians of journalism the responsibility of their statements. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that a contingency of that nature would have compelled me to vote against such an excess in imperialistic extravagance. But the hon. the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) asks this house for a total sum of \$34,091,873.42, of which \$22,339,223.42 is for our defence scheme, and \$11,752,650 for the air force. Is this excessive? Is it acceptable? Does my duty as a member of this house authorize me to vote in favour of such an expenditure? I will endeavour in a few words to answer these questions to the best of my knowledge.

And I owe all men and women who voted for me a clear and definite explanation so as to dispel any ambiguity and establish on a rational basis my position as representative of the electors of Labelle and as a member of the dominion Liberal party. Moreover, having given to the press an interview which certain newspapers of my province and of Canada were kind enough to reproduce, I feel that I am under the obligation of proving that my vote will be consistent with my public state-

[Mr. Leader.]

ments. The text of my interview as published in *Le Droit* of January 20, 1937 follows:

The agitation caused by this important question of the defence estimates which the honourable the Minister of National Defence will bring down during this session of the federal parliament, has stirred public opinion. I do not believe that this is the proper time to reach a definite conclusion before having had an opportunity of considering these estimates and hearing what the honourable minister will have to say by way of explanation.

We do not know as yet what amount parliament will be asked to vote, nor the purpose for which these sums will be spent.

A definite conclusion would therefore be premature.

I am in favour of ensuring security within our territory and having our customs service watch closely our coasts and the American border, either with ships or aircraft. But these expenditures should be within our means and I am not prepared to vote in favour of excessive disbursements for that item.

As to the important question of Canada's participation in imperial foreign wars, I am altogether against it, either in men or money.

Mr. LACOMBE: Hear, hear.

Mr. LALONDE:

It seems to me that the explicit statements of the right honourable Mackenzie King and of the honourable senator Dandurand on this subject are sufficient to appease public opinion. This does not imply that we should not be very cautious should legislation to that effect be introduced. This is a question of principle on which we must stand firmly. The future of Canada is at stake! All true patriots must have but one slogan: Canada first! And the interest of Canada is not to be found in Flanders, in the Spanish peninsula or in Ethiopia, but on the shores of the St. Lawrence as well as on the territory of the other provinces in the dominion.

Mr. LACOMBE: Hear, hear.

Mr. LALONDE: I must therefore follow this program and abide by this principle. Indeed, I do not claim to meet the demands of the nationalists who, tired of seeking blindly some formulae for our economic recovery in the policies of the Liberal party, turn towards a political and utopian idealism of exaggerated secession, and selfish nationalism whose mean ideals are incapable of looking beyond the horizon of the province of Quebec.

Are these estimates excessive? Are they acceptable? Before expressing my opinion on this question, I think it would be important to set the scope of the discussion.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Hear, hear.

Mr. LALONDE: We have before us a motion of non-confidence; we must first discuss this motion on its merits before considering the estimates intrinsically. The motion reads as follows: