

a principle for which our forefathers fought and struggled for years. It is a principle which has been dominant in this country for fifty years and which will remain dominant for all time to come, irrespective of the attempt which is now being made by this Government to over-ride and uproot that principle, that is the sound, solid principle of parliamentary control over public expenditure. In view of the situation, I desire to move:

That clause 5 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'Majesty' in the third line and inserting in lieu thereof the words as provided in the Naval Service Act.

So the clause would read:

The said sum shall be used and applied, and the said ships shall be constructed and placed at the disposal of His Majesty as provided in the Naval Service Act.

And that Naval Service Act, as I have already stated, provides that these ships can be placed at the disposal of His Majesty by the Governor in Council in the event of an emergency or a supposed emergency, and that having been done, if Parliament is not in session, Parliament is to be called in session and asked to approve of what the Governor in Council has done. What can hon. members opposite want more than that? What more could they do under this Act? There is the distinction—a distinction with a positive difference—that whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service as provided in the preceding sections, if Parliament is then separated by an adjournment or prorogation that will not expire within ten days, then a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall have an opportunity to approve what the Governor in Council has done. Is not that a sufficient safeguard for the people? Is not that a safeguard of the naval service of the British Empire? This Government insists that without any consideration of Parliament whatever they shall have the power to hand over \$35,000,000 worth of battleships to the British Government, on such terms as shall be agreed upon between the Governor in Council and His Majesty's Government—and Parliament know nothing what that agreement shall be. I say the very basic principle of this Naval Aid Act is wrong, because it takes out of the hands of the people's representatives the power to control the money or what is bought with that money. The basic principle of the Naval Service Act is right, because it leaves in the hands of the people's representatives—the people who own and pay the money—the right to control that money and the outspending of that money when spent.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): When the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile) closed his eloquent address, I was on the point of rising to address you, Mr. Chairman, on clause 4 before the committee, but my right hon. friend the Prime Minister closed the door against me. I would not like to apply to the Prime Minister the epithets used by the hon. member for Welland, because of the statements made by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. But I must say I felt the wind in my face when the door closed. However, allow me to say, that I shall address you upon another topic relating to the same question, no doubt, the control by Parliament of the public expenditure of the people's money, so eloquently advocated by my hon. friend from Welland county. That hon. gentleman's forefathers, like mine, fought for this principle, a principle to which the great Joseph Howe of Nova Scotia devoted his life. Allow me to say, that were I from Nova Scotia and advocating the principle advocated by the Government of the day, I should expect the shade of Joseph Howe to rise in ire and chastise me and everyone who supported me. Very little do I intend to add to the debate this evening. When I attempted to rise before it was in part for the purpose of citing an article relating to this subject, from one of the leading newspapers of Great Britain, for the consideration of the members of this House and the members of the press of Canada. It has been said in this House and by some members of the Conservative party that we have been here for the last four or five months doing nothing but talking. If there has ever been an occasion since Confederation or before Confederation under the great union of Canada when an Opposition were justified in exercising every possible means at their command in parliamentary debate in order not only to place before Parliament their views but to prolong a debate in order to gain time to see what public opinion would declare in Canada as well as in Great Britain, this is the occasion. I say that to-day we owe the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and his noble, intelligent lieutenants who have kept up this debate from day to day and week to week until the present time, a debt of gratitude, and the views which they have expressed have been supported by the best elements of public opinion in Great Britain as well as in Canada. The attitude taken by the Liberal party that there should be an appeal to the people on this great question has been approved by public opinion in Canada and also in Great Britain. When we on this side of the House have asked for an appeal to the people we have been met with the reply from hon. gentlemen opposite that we were not sin-