

Now, that resolution was unanimously adopted in this House, and it was put in that form at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, now the Prime Minister, himself. It was the policy of the Conservative party of that day, and it was the policy of the whole people of Canada. That policy was in line with the undertakings of the Prime Minister of Canada at the colonial conferences, which undertakings on his part were ratified and approved by this Parliament. When hon. gentlemen opposite say: 'why did you not go to the country; why did you not submit your naval policy to the people at that time,' the answer is, that there was no division of opinion on this question. It was not a new question. The matter was mooted and discussed at the Imperial conference in 1902, and at various conferences after that date before it was put in the concrete shape of the resolution passed unanimously in this House. Therefore there was no need to go to the people. In this case there is a departure from the recognized principles of responsible government. There is an innovation that should be submitted to the people. This is a question on which the people are divided; therefore the people should be called upon to pass upon it.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Will the hon. gentleman tell us before he resumes his seat if he approves of the principle of the amendment that a redistribution Bill should be introduced during this session of Parliament?

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am discussing the naval question, not the question of redistribution. I shall have something to say on the question of redistribution when the proper time arrives, and I hope that my hon. friend will be more zealous in trying to do something for Nova Scotia on the question of redistribution than he has shown himself up to the present to be for the development of the shipbuilding industry of that province through this naval programme of his leader. The then leader of the Opposition and his chief lieutenant, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, were opposed to a contribution at that time, and the reason that was urged then applies with equal force to any kind of contribution. Let me quote one statement more for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me quote the words of the right hon. leader of the Government himself. He said:

It has been suggested that instead of the organization of a Canadian naval force, there should be a system of annual contribution from this country to the Mother Country.

He says 'annual' contribution, but any kind of a contribution has to be regarded in the same way.

—and I am free to admit that, from the strategical point of view, I would be inclined to agree with the view of the Admiralty that this would be the best way for the great self-

governing dominions of the Empire to make their contributions.

But, Sir, from a constitutional and political standpoint, I am opposed to it, for many reasons.

The reasons apply against this policy of contribution just as forcibly as they do against the policy of annual contributions.

In the first place, I do not believe that it would endure. In the second place, it would be a source of friction. It would become a bone of partisan contention. It would be subject to criticism as to the character and the amount of the contribution in both parliaments. It would not be permanent or continuous. It would conduce, if anything could conduce, to severing the present connection between Canada and the Empire.

Permanent co-operation in defence, in my opinion, can only be accomplished by the use of our own material, the employment of our own people, the development and utilization of our own skill and resourcefulness, and above all, by impressing upon the people a sense of responsibility for their share in international affairs.

Well, what sense of responsibility is going to be impressed upon the people by having them dive down into their pockets, gather up the shekels and send this contribution over to the Old Country? I repeat that the policy of the Conservative party at that time was not one of contribution but was in favour of Canadian naval defence. Let me quote some more Conservative authorities. I prefer quoting from Conservative authorities rather than Liberal because hon. gentlemen opposite cannot dispute the authority of their own organs and leaders. The Ottawa Journal, Conservative, after disclaiming any inspiration for this statement of what should be the Government's policy, said:

The Montreal Star desires, in its customary vociferous manner, to have Mr. Borden present two dreadnoughts to England. The Hamilton Herald wants to see Canada giving an annual money contribution towards the British navy. The Journal prefers the establishment of a Canadian navy. We have never seen reason to change this view.

The Montreal Star's proposition of giving dreadnoughts is well enough, if that step would not interfere by Canada, but it likely would, and no temporary measure, however interesting and efficient, should be allowed to hinder a definite, resolute and continuous policy of co-operation by Canada in the naval assurance of the Empire.

The Hamilton Herald's idea is the worst of all:

May we ask what particular effeminacy characterizes this country that to undertake a direct naval responsibility is unwise? Are we not fit to rank in national effort with Argentina or Chili, or China, or Denmark, or Belgium? What's the matter with us. Is the breed here inferior to that in Australia or New Zealand? We have constructed the greatest railways in the world, and the greatest canals; we have in forty years weld-