

Probably he (meaning the Prime Minister) knows more than I do, and I am not asking him to disclose anything to this House which ought not to be disclosed but would it not be wise to omit that paragraph altogether? I tell him that I and every man on this side of the House stand firmly for the principal that the rights of self-government which we now hold shall not in any way be detracted from in the slightest degree.

He thought then that a policy of contribution would be detracting from our right of self-government, that it would be interfering with our autonomy, but hon. gentlemen opposite now argue that because we vote this money, because we have parliamentary authority to that extent, therefore our autonomy is not affected at all. But the leader of the Opposition, when speaking on this question, did not take that view. On the contrary, he suggests by his remarks there, that it would be interfering with our autonomy. Then he goes on to say:

But is there any need of inserting this somewhat negative proposition in a resolution which ought to go forth as a message not only to the people of the Empire but to the people of the world.

Then he refers to the further amendment in paragraph 4. He says, at page 3521:

Just one word as to a further amendment which I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend. In paragraph 4, he proceeds:—

The House will certainly approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial conference, and in close sympathy with a view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

I would be glad if my right hon. friend could accept the suggestion of inserting in that paragraph some word which would indicate an intention to act promptly. If my right hon. friend would insert before the word organization some such word as 'immediate' or even 'early,' I think it would greatly improve the paragraph; it would meet with my approval, and I do not think it would be disapproved of by any hon. member of this House.

How does he propose to bring about a speedy organization? How does he propose to bring about any immediate organization? By delaying it two years? By delaying it indefinitely, for according to him it is going to take fifty years before we can have a navy, and according to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite and of the Prime Minister himself, would appear that they have no intention of building a Canadian navy. He proposes to embark on this policy of contribution. I say that if there is reason for giving a contribution of \$35,000,000

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).

this year, there will be equal reason next year. If it is necessary as a premium of insurance, for the protection of our trade and commerce, as the hon. member for Calgary said, we will have to pay our premium yearly, or our insurance will likely run out. If the test of our loyalty and devotion to the Crown is the payment of a cash contribution this year, will the same test not be applicable next year? As we grow older, and our revenues increase, it is reasonable to suppose, it is logical to conclude, that these contributions will become greater and greater year after year, and that in a very short time Downing street, or the Lords of the Admiralty will begin to think they have a right to tax us, will accept it as a matter of right, and not as a matter of favour, and will recognize it as our duty to the Empire. When the subject was under discussion at that time, there was no suggestion on the part of the Opposition that the policy of contribution was an acceptable one. On the contrary, the arguments put forth were diametrically opposed to any suggestion of contribution. The then leader of the Opposition and his first lieutenant, the hon. member for North Toronto put themselves unequivocally on record as against contribution, and they put themselves straight and clearly on record in favour of a Canadian naval policy. The resolution, with the addition of the words suggested by the present Prime Minister, was adopted unanimously, the suggestion of the then leader of the Opposition was accepted and the resolution that was adopted was in these words:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.