

House of Representatives and the Canadian House of Commons. There is no government on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States, no executive there responsible for administration in any way whatever. Besides, the House of Representatives of the United States governs about ninety millions of people. But see what is said about that House of Representatives in this parliamentary document which I have under my hand. This document contains a letter written from Washington, from the office of the Embassy there, where they look into matters very carefully, and they give this quotation as to the situation in the House of Representatives:

In Washington the new Congressman meets a discipline which for cancelling individuality, is not equalled in any organization in the world possibly outside the German army. . . . The control of the body by a few men, their security in the rules, their seeming callousness to public sentiment, their ridicule of the ideal, their seeming contempt for enthusiastic initiative, all these are felt months before he finds definite evidence of their existence. . . .

These are all things I have pointed out as sure to follow the adoption of these rules in this House.

He finds in Congress a machine which is in its very nature a denial of the principle of democracy. . . . a flat contradiction of the form of government which he has celebrated every Fourth of July.

A strange example on which to pattern the representative body of this country—Russia, and a condition of things in the United States which the people there themselves rebel against. In the United States they glory in the Senate over the fact that ill-digested legislation put through the House of Representatives receives from the second body of Congress the most careful attention and is scrutinized with the greatest particularity. In that body it is conceded by every student of affairs in the United States, you have the prudent attention which must be paid at all times to propositions of a legislative nature before they are crystallized into statutes. And why is all this being done? My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says that the increasing business of the country makes it necessary. There is nothing in that argument. My hon. friend, the one man who has to do with business propositions in this House, certainly has nothing to complain of. When he came along with his Bank Act we discussed it for two days and sent it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where it has been discussed with the greatest care. He cannot complain so far as his West India Treaty Bill and his budget are concerned, for he has not brought these forward for action. There is nothing

whatever in the theory that the business of the country is being delayed. Other hon. gentlemen tell us frankly that these resolutions were introduced because of the discussion on the Navy Bill. Why should not we discuss this Navy Bill? What is this Parliament here for? Is it, as I suppose hon. gentlemen will expect us to do in the future, to stand up and vote when they bring a Bill and pass it through? Is that what we are here for? Or are we here for what our fathers were here for—the men who laid the foundations of this country, who considered questions with the greatest possible care, and who recognized that the greater and more important the problem submitted to us for action the greater the attention that should be paid to it. Here was the peculiar situation with regard to this proposal: the Government had no mandate for this proposition. In no province of this country was the Naval Bill discussed except in the province of Quebec, and as a result of that discussion there are twenty-one men sitting behind the Government who are here because they declared that they did not want Canada to have anything to do with naval expenditure at all. How much did the Minister of Finance talk about the navy in Ontario in the last election? How many times did he declare on the platform opposition to the policy of the late Government?

Mr. GRAHAM: He discussed tomatoes.

Mr. MACDONALD: He knows that he never discussed the navy.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not a word.

Mr. MACDONALD: What mandate has he on this question? I would ask every one of the other members who come from the province of Ontario, what mandate they had upon this question.

Mr. BURNHAM: Patriotism.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) had more to do with Ne Temere, he told us. I suppose the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) lay awake nights thinking about this navy question. There is not a member of the Government from Ontario who could produce reliable evidence to satisfy even one of his own colleagues that he had a mandate on this question, to say nothing of satisfying hon. members of the House generally. If these hon. gentlemen were even here as representatives of the old Conservative party, with its traditions and with the assertions made on behalf of that party in some parts of the Dominion, they might make an argument. But they are here as a coalition Government, sitting here since October, 1911, yet without the Prime Minister or the men with whom he made the coalition ever deigning to give this House an ex-