

clared the attitude of Canada in the following words:

At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian Government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian Government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the Mother Country from some of the burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the Imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced Imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of Imperial unity.

That was the position held by the then Premier of Canada, and that position met with the approval of this Parliament. The matter was discussed during various sessions of Parliament, and not a word of dissent was uttered against the principle then laid down. But there was nothing done in the matter of permanent defence until 1909, when the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, then the member for North Toronto—no doubt with the approval of the whole Conservative party, and as if for the purpose of forcing Canada to burden itself with naval expenditure—introduced on the 9th of March, 1909, a resolution which declared:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

Thus it was declared that it was the duty of Canada to provide protection for her exposed coast line and great seaports—not a word about the sending of money contributions. Let me quote the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this connection:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neigh-

bour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid. It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year, after ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money.

Each time these quotations are read, hon. gentlemen will find something good in them. There is a condensed and concentrated wisdom in the sentiments embodied in the language of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I think I owe no apology to the House for repeating his words.

Mr. McKAY: Does the hon. gentleman know that when the member for North Toronto was using these words he was speaking of a permanent naval policy—a permanent annual contribution?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Certainly.

Mr. McKAY: Well, that is altogether different.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The arguments which the hon. member for North Toronto used and the reasons which he advanced against a permanent policy of contribution are just as sound against any form of contribution, and the whole tenor of his arguments, and of the arguments of the Opposition of that day, was: 'We propose contribution because there is an emergency. If there was no emergency, however, the situation would be different; we would have to embark upon a permanent Canadian policy.' I say that the logic of the hon. member for North Toronto on that occasion is just as sound to-day as it was then. It is true that he now sets up the contention that he was referring to contribution year after year—a permanent policy of contribution, but the argument against this contribution which we are now considering is just as strong as that against a policy of permanent contribution. Let me quote further from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, as they appear on page 3484 of 'Hansard':

You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself, there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left; there will be no preparation of the soil or beginning of the growth of the product of defence.

Then he says, page 3496:

We must have beginnings—

I invite the attention of the hon. member for Prince Albert to these words:

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.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish).