

No suggestion of contribution there, but, on the contrary, he argues that we should have a naval force for the defence of this country, if for nothing else. Let me repeat it again:

We must have beginnings; these must at first be small; but some time or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom to sow the seed at once—

That was three years ago, or more.

—and cultivate its growth, as best we may, in our circumstances and with our resources, until at last we arrive at that stage of expansion which we have reached in other great lines of our country's progress. You will notice that while I have tried to discuss the pros and cons in connection with this method, while I have stated reasons in favour of and others against it, my own mind tends rather towards the employment of another form than that of an out and out money contribution.

He was against contribution in any form, and the reasons he gives there are as applicable, I say, to the situation now as they were then. He argued there for 'another form' than a money contribution. That form, as he indicated earlier in his speech, was 'a naval force for the defence of the country.'

Mr. McKAY: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the hon. member for North Toronto was speaking of a fixed policy, and that, at the conclusion of his remarks, he declared that if a proposal of a contribution in case of emergency were introduced he would support it?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Certainly; that is exactly what I have stated. The only ground on which the hon. gentlemen who are now members of the Government justified contribution when in opposition was that there was an emergency. They conjured up an emergency because of the alleged attitude and preparations for war of Germany, and said they would have to do something, and that this was the most tangible way in which they could give evidence of their loyalty and their desire to assist the Mother Country. As I have said, I presume that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto was introduced for the purpose of forcing the hand of the then Liberal Government and compelling it to embark upon a naval policy. An amendment was proposed by the then Prime Minister, and I quote it in full, as it is found on page 3512 of 'Hansard':

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 reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that

under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House has observed with satisfaction the relief afforded in recent years to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom through the assumption by the Canadian people of considerable military expenditure formerly charged upon the Imperial treasury.

The House will cordially 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 full 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.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifices 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 the honour of the Empire.

There was a suggestion on that occasion of a contribution, and the leader of the Opposition, speaking on this question, and referring to the second paragraph of the amendment, on page 3512 of 'Hansard', said:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that.

I direct the attention of hon. members opposite to these words:

I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that.

Now, what has transpired since? What wisdom has he acquired since then to justify him in going back on that policy? He no doubt carefully considered the principles he laid down there as to what was best in the interests of Canada, and he, as a Canadian, said he was for having a Canadian force of our own. How does he reconcile his attitude to-day with his attitude then? He referred to the second paragraph of the amendment which deals with the constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions, and which criticised stated contributions to the Imperial treasury. The leader of the Opposition approved of the sentiment expressed in that second paragraph. You have his words on page 3512 of 'Hansard,' and he gives the reasons why he approved of that sentiment, for he says: