

confidence, that the Liberal party had no sympathy with or confidence in that Act.

Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSS—No, No.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I say that the Liberal Party previous to their defeat in 1911 had ample opportunity to show their faith by their works if they had chosen to enter upon a building programme under the Naval Act of 1910.

Some Hon. MEMBERS—Hear, Hear.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—In the beginning of May 1911 they had received tenders for the building of those ships. Those tenders lay in the Government offices. The month of May went by, the month of June went by, the month of July went by, the month of August and the month of September went by, but those hon. gentlemen did nothing towards carrying out that programme—they who had expressed such anxiety and such solicitude for assisting Great Britain in the difficulties which were then looming up on the horizon. Did they show any anxiety? Not the slightest. The tenders were pigeon-holed. Inaction characterized the Government. All the passivity of indifference which could be exercised was done in absolutely ignoring the existence of those tenders. Was such evidence as this to be accepted that those gentlemen were sincere in carrying out such a programme as they had declared for? I say it most irresistibly established that those gentlemen had no intention of building the ships for which they had asked tenders. Then furthermore they had within their own grasp the information of their own experts, that if they had entered upon that building programme for which they had asked tenders, those ships would have been obsolete before they were built. And why was that? I say that the Government of the day outlined a building programme which they knew would not be carried out, and that they embodied terms into that programme which would necessarily warrant them in neglecting the carrying of it into operation. Hence, we find their experts declaring that the ships would be out of date, would be obsolete before they were constructed. That, I say, is one of the compelling reasons why the Government of the day did not proceed with the building thereof. Furthermore, in answer to what my hon. friend has said, I say there is no question, and I venture to say my hon. friend will not controvert the statement, that this Govern-

ment had a mandate from the people to reject that Act.

Some Hon. GENTLEMEN—When?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—At the last general election Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden, the present Prime Minister, announced in 1910 what his policy would be; then again in 1911 he announced what that policy would be. If there was any plank in the platform of the Conservative party in the general elections of 1911 it was that particular plank which defined most clearly and beyond all doubt what the attitude of the Government would be upon that question. Mr. Borden in the House of Commons stated emphatically that his first act would be to make a substantial contribution, by ships or otherwise, to meet the emergency of the hour. He further stated that, after that, a permanent policy would be promulgated. We went to the country, and the country pronounced upon it. Hon. gentlemen opposite know, my hon. friends from Quebec know, that the province of Quebec, to almost a man, was unanimously opposed to the Naval Act of 1910.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—Why don't you repeal it if the country is opposed to it? You have not got the courage.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED — I therefore affirm that the present Government had a mandate to declare and to introduce into Parliament the measure of last session which they did. If there is anything which has marked the career of the Government since they came into office, it has been the implementing of every pledge which it has made to the electorate. I challenge any hon. gentleman to point out wherein this Government has not shown by its acts the intention to fulfil every pledge made to the electorate at that time. Well, what do we find? We find this, that, notwithstanding the mandate given by the electorate to the Government, this Senate, during the last session of Parliament, undertook to do what? Undertook to bring about a dissolution. This Senate did not pronounce itself upon any alternative measure. If hon. gentlemen in this Senate, who opposed that measure last session, were sincere in a desire to be of assistance to the Empire, they would have proposed an alternative scheme. But was there any alternative scheme proposed by my