

270223

270223

36

COMMONS

overwhelming confidence of the House of Commons in Great Britain which he thought he ought to have.

Between 1937 and 1939 I submit that this government had ample warning of what was taking place in Europe. I am told—I cannot vouch for the truth of this because I have not access to the proof—that everything that was done by the government was done with absolutely no reference to what might take place in Europe, that the question of overseas operations was taboo.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I think I should take issue with him immediately on any statement that—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The right hon. gentleman will have plenty of time to reply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But when my friend makes a statement, and says he has no authority for the statement he makes, it is part of my duty to see that a statement which is incorrect is immediately denied; I say the statement just made is wholly incorrect.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course I know that the right hon. gentleman will take the opportunity to deny it, but I state that it is my information; and more than that, as proof of the truth of the position which I am trying to formulate, my understanding of the debates of this parliament is that on every vote for national defence that was passed from 1935 to 1939 it was emphasized that the money was for the defence of Canada and the defence of Canada only. That, I submit, is some proof of the truth of the position I am trying to define to-day.

Now may I ask where was Canada's first line of defence during all the trying period before September, 1939? Was it in Canada or was it over there where to-day they are striving with the beasts of Ephesus to preserve our liberty? We have never had more than one line of defence; our first and only line has been the British navy, and we ought to thank God reverently that we have such a defence—to which, however, we do not contribute a single dollar or a single man. It is only in times of stress such as we are going through now that we recognize the truth of these matters. As was stated on Friday last by the hon. member for Vancouver North (Mr. Sinclair), in normal times we take for granted the privileges of a British subject, and it is only in a period of trial and stress such as that in which we are now living that we realize what are the privileges

(Mr. R. B. Hanson (York-Sunbury).)

of a British subject and comprehend that during all these years the British government has been providing our first line of defence. Why, Canada could not defend herself against Siam! Make no mistake about that. Why all this talk about the defence of Canada? Why should we not be honest with ourselves and with the people of this country and say that our defence is the common defence of the British empire and our gallant allies? That is the only defence worth anything at this time, when our liberties and our very civilization are at stake, but we have done nothing to assist.

Where was the security of Canada ever menaced? Was it to the south? Well, for more than a hundred years, ever since the Rush-Bagot treaty, there has not been a single fort, a single gun or a single ship along the whole international boundary. That is a matter of mutual congratulation to the people of this dominion and the people of the republic to our south. We are not and never have been menaced by those friendly neighbours. On the contrary in the city of Kingston, on July 1, 1938, in the presence of the Prime Minister of this country, the president of the great republic to the south offered to take us under that country's wing and to defend us if we were ever attacked by an enemy from without. This afternoon I have no intention of saying one word repelling the goodwill of the president of the United States; it would be not only inappropriate but wholly inexpedient that I or anyone else should do so at this time, because I greatly appreciate the friendliness and goodwill of that country not only towards us but towards our mother country and our allies, and I am hopeful that it may become more than goodwill. But what they may do over there in that connection is their own business, and theirs alone. I wonder, however, if any self-respecting Canadian within the sound of my voice or anywhere in this country wants to see Canada dependent at any time for her national safety upon the government of the United States. Surely if we are a nation our self-respect will demand something more of ourselves than that. I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but if the day ever comes when we have to shelter ourselves behind the armed forces of the Stars and Stripes, that day we will haul down the Union Jack in Canada and it will never go up again.

No, I do not think we have any enemy to our south. Then what enemy have we to the west? Well, perhaps we have a potential enemy there. I do not want to say very much about that, but I believe that potential enemy is so busily engaged in digesting its gains in

270224

270224

MAY 20, 1940

37

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