

China that it really is not a potential enemy of this country at all. Certainly we have nothing to fear from the north. Therefore our only enemy must be in the east, among the dictators of Europe; and if that be so it is not only common sense that instead of spending money on the construction of emplacements, embankments and forts in Canada we should endeavour to the utmost to further the cause of our mother country and our allies in the terrible conflict which is now raging? That is the view I take; that, I think, is the sensible thing. That is what I, as a self-respecting Canadian, believe this country should have done.

The speech from the throne contains certain statements with reference to collaboration with the mother country. I intend to refer to this point a little later, but before I forget I should like to invite the Prime Minister to lay before the house, if it is in writing, the evidence to show that this government has collaborated with the British government. I believe the people of Canada are asking what was the degree of collaboration, if any, requested by the British government, and what was the degree of cooperation given by this government both prior to and since the outbreak of the war. I quite appreciate that there may be confidential communications which the Prime Minister cannot lay before this house, but I do suggest to him that the people of Canada will not be satisfied with anything less than substantial evidence of what the situation is, and accordingly I invite him to table that evidence.

The most striking evidence of what I fear is lack of collaboration is to be found in the matter of air defence. If my information and my reading of the evidence are correct, through the Prime Minister this country refused to collaborate with the mother country in 1937 and 1938 with respect to air training in Canada. As I understand the Prime Minister's position, as pointed out in a speech made in the house on July 1, 1938, the reason assigned was that it would be a violation or an infringement of the sovereignty of Canada.

I have before me the text of the Prime Minister's statement. It is, however, well known in the house and I shall not spread it on the record. It might have been—I do not agree that it was—academically and theoretically a sound position for the right hon. gentleman to take at that time. But, from a practical point of view, and having regard to what has since occurred, what a position for Canada to take! In effect we were saying to the mother country, "Although you lack space, of which we have an abundance in Canada, we cannot allow you at your

own expense to come out here and train men for aviation because, forsooth, it would be a violation of the sovereignty of the country." I hope I have not overstated the position.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must say my hon. friend has completely misstated it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think so. I shall read what the right hon. gentleman said, as reported at page 4527 of *Hansard* of 1938:

May I say a word with respect to the idea of having the imperial air force set up flying schools in Canada to train their pilots; in short, a military station put down in Canada, owned, maintained and operated by the imperial government for imperial purposes.

In those sentences the Prime Minister is setting out the premise of the position. Then he says:

I must say that long ago Canadian governments finally settled the constitutional principle that in Canadian territory there could be no military establishments unless they were owned, maintained and controlled by the Canadian government responsible to the Canadian parliament and people. In the end the imperial naval stations and army garrisons were withdrawn and Canadian authority took over.

I remember when that was done, and I do not think the question of sovereignty was the primary principle in accordance with which the British government gave up stations at Halifax and elsewhere in Canada. I think it was because the Canadian government were willing to take over and save the British government some money. I well remember when the Leinster regiment left Halifax. I was a boy going to school in those days, and my recollection is that it was not a question of sovereignty, at all; rather, it was a question of expediency, a question of dollars and cents or of pounds, shillings and pence.

Then the Prime Minister goes on to say:

A reversal of that principle and that historical process at this date is something the Canadian people would not for a moment entertain.

Well, I wonder if that would be true to-day? If the British government wanted to train men in Canada to-day I wonder if the Canadian people would show any resentment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would my hon. friend put the case fairly? There has never been a refusal to allow men to train in Canada. The government was prepared to place facilities at their disposal.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister is drawing a fine distinction. However, I am coming to that. From a practical point of view what is the difference? The difference is that on the one hand there would be a theoretical violation of sovereignty