

form of resolution which I took informally across the floor of this House and submitted to hon. gentlemen on the other side. I submitted it to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), all hon. gentlemen who had taken part in that debate, and every one of them without exception told me that the resolution in the amended terms in which I proposed it was absolutely acceptable to them. The only dissenting voice, and that only with regard to one minor feature of the Bill, was the voice of the hon. member for Westmorland, who thought that the power given by that proposed resolution to the Minister of Railways and Canals to build a line not exceeding twenty-five miles in length was too great a power. I was about to consent to modify it when another hon. gentleman on the other side, the hon. member for Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) strenuously objected to any change, and desired the resolution to remain as it was, and it did remain as it was, and the Bill founded upon it went through this House without one dissenting voice. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in his seat, as 'Hansard' will show, when the Bill passed this House, and he did not raise his voice in opposition to it. The Liberal majority in the Senate saw fit so to mangle that Bill with changes and amendments that it became absolutely useless for the purpose for which it was intended. It came back here and I asked that those amendments should not be assented to. To my astonishment the leader of the Opposition stood up in his place and defended the action of his friends in the Senate, although the Bill in the form in which it left the House of Commons had been unanimously assented to not only by hon. members on this side but by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as well. So the Bill failed to carry because we could not accept the Senate amendments. And so it was with the Tariff Commission Bill.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has referred to the Naval Aid Bill, and I desire to say a few words in explaining the action of the Government in that regard. Let me review the situation in a few words. Firmly convinced that the conditions disclosed in the Admiralty memorandum demanded immediate and effective aid from Canada, the Government, in accordance with its mandate from the

people introduced in this Parliament on the 5th day of December, 1912, the Naval Aid Bill by resolution. That Bill provided for the construction of three battleships of the most modern and powerful type to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the empire and to be subject to recall upon reasonable notice if and when the Canadian people should decide to establish one or more fleet units or other distinctive naval forces. The measure was debated at great length in this House and was persistently and defiantly obstructed. It did not pass this House until the rules had been so amended as to prevent such obstruction. Eventually the Bill was rejected in the Upper Chamber by senators appointed by the late Government previously to its defeat in 1911. The measure proposed by the Government created a profound impression not only within this empire, but throughout the world. There is little doubt that if the Bill had passed, the determination of Canada thus expressed would have constituted an important influence in bringing about a most desirable cessation in the rivalry of armaments. The partisan considerations and misguided influences which occasioned the perverse and maladroit action of the Senate were not realized or understood either within the empire or throughout the world. In certain important quarters the Senate's action was welcomed with rejoicing as a clear indication that in providing for the common defence of the empire upon the high seas the mother country must stand alone so far as Canada is concerned, and that this Dominion must be regarded not as a strength but as a weakness to the empire in time of peril. That the impression created by the Senate's action was profoundly unfortunate and mischievous is evidenced by many comments in great European journals. As an illustration one quotation must suffice, although many might be given. The quotation to which I allude is from the *Hamburger Nachrichten* of June 5, 1913:—

Whatever may be decided upon later, the decision of the Canadian Senate means at any rate a heavy moral and material loss for the defence of the empire.

I heard, a moment ago, some gentlemen opposite cheering the Senate's action; Would they still cheer in face of that? Well, we are at least glad to know their appreciation of the duty of this country to the empire. (Reading):

Whatever may be decided upon later, the actual decision of the Canadian Senate means at any rate a heavy moral and material loss for