

hon. friends opposite? No; their whole purpose was one of delay, one of destruction of the Bill. It was consequently moved that no action should be taken on the Bill until the matter was submitted to the electorate. Did hon. gentlemen think that a body appointed for life, irresponsible to the people so far as the popular will is expressed, would have constitutionally the right to bring about a dissolution of Parliament by sending the Government to the country, particularly after having come fresh from the people? This was the attitude taken by my hon. friends opposite. Hence we find ourselves in the position, of this measure having been rejected without any alternative measure being proposed, and without any declaration or pronouncement having been made by my hon. friends as to the assistance they were prepared to give to the Empire, at this time of stress and necessity. My hon. friend has expressed solicitude that something should be done; the next move is by my hon. friend. The Government has already moved in the matter. Its move has met with a distinct refusal on the part of this Senate to accept their measure, or to assist in formulating a measure which would be a credit to Canada, or of assistance to the Empire. I hope that after the expressions of solicitude made by my hon. friend, we may have some pronouncement, in the near future, as to where hon. gentlemen opposite do stand, as to whether they are willing to assist the Empire at all, or whether they purpose continuing the policy of delay—I might say of obstruction—which characterized the action of the Liberal party the last session of Parliament.

In conclusion, let me say to hon. gentlemen that while they talk of doing something, I would suggest that my hon. friends opposite should, on this question, show less anxiety for the unity of the Liberal party, and more for the unity of the Empire. I hope the work of the session will be satisfactory to all of us. I shall be only too glad to urge on the Government to introduce any measures they may have, as far as practicable, in this Chamber. It has always been a matter of regret that we have found difficulty in introducing many measures which I think could be first brought down here with greater advantage than to the House of Commons. But, as I have said on former occasions, the desire has been natural on the part of ministers having

portfolios in the Commons, to take charge of their own legislation, and therefore we have been handicapped in the matter of introducing such legislation in the Senate. I hope we may have a profitable and satisfactory session of Parliament, and make good progress with the business of the country.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I cordially concur in the sentiments which the Government leader in this House has expressed in resuming his seat. I hope we shall have a harmonious and pleasant session, and I hope the Senate will do good work that will redound to its credit. The hon. gentleman spoke of his discursive remarks. I must ask in advance the pardon of the House if my remarks are even more discursive than those of the hon. gentleman. It is a somewhat remarkable fact that the two subjects which have been most discussed today are subjects which really do not appear in the speech from the Throne. I wish to place myself on record as I really feel with respect to the Naval Bill. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who leads the Liberal party in this House, in expressing the opinion that the Government would have been expected this session to introduce again the Bill which was introduced last year, and which we decided should be referred to the people. I really agree with the leader of the Government that such a course could hardly have been expected. Further, I do not myself feel that, at the present moment, it would be a desirable thing to enter upon any very heavy expenditure for naval purposes. But, while I agree with the leader of the Government so far, there are certain things which he said in connection with the Naval Bill, in which I cannot concur. The hon. gentleman said that the Naval Bill received the approval of all loyal people in Canada. The hon. gentleman could not realize the force of what he said when he made that statement, because the fact is that I believe that a majority of people in Canada have never approved of the Government Bill. I am satisfied a great majority of the people do not now approve of it at all. It is not because these people are disloyal, it is because they do not think the scheme proposed by the Government is the one most in the interests of the Empire and of Canada. After all, the interests of Canada should come first with

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.