

country, who by reason of their being your masters as well as ours are entitled to have a hearing and know what are the views which are being presented in this House, and what are the facts which ought to influence them in the decision which they are ultimately to give, because they are the final court of appeal to which you and we must appeal. I pray that the day will soon come when you will be obliged to appeal to that court of appeal. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance stated a night or two ago in Toronto that, if there were an election, the Liberals would be beaten. I challenge my hon. friend to bring on an election.

Mr. WHITE: Without dissenting from what my hon. friend has stated, will he allow me to say that I made no such statement? I said that the Liberals did not want an election. I think it is the last thing under Heaven that they want to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend can determine very quickly as to whether we want an election or not. Let him offer it to us. He talks about not being able to carry on the Government of this country, because he has not got Supply through, Supply for which he has never asked, Supply one dollar of which has never yet been asked for except for the purpose of closing up the supplementary estimates of the current year. Let my hon. friend make us that proposition. If I know anything of the feelings of hon. members on this side of the House, they will meet my hon. friend quickly, and will give him Supply sufficient to carry on the affairs of the country until there is an opportunity to issue the writs and to have an election. There is a willingness on the part of hon. members on this side of the House for an election. Not only the Liberal members of this House, but the Liberals throughout the country are eager for an election on this question. The people have not had a fair opportunity of considering the questions which are involved in the important discussion which has been going on.

You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if I follow, even although it may be digressing a little from the subject which is immediately before the House, the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins). He has called your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the proceedings which took place in committee upon the Naval Bill. Let me call your attention to some things with which perhaps you are not familiar, and which my hon. friend has not thought it worth while to bring to your notice. During these two long weeks, Mr. Speaker, I can well understand that you found it necessary to absent yourself from the House in order to take the rest which you

would so much need. My right hon. friend, in one of those extraordinary manifestos which he has recently issued to the country, says that during those two weeks there was the fullest opportunity for discussion—during those strenuous hours when we were forced to remain here day after day and night after night. Does he call that discussion? Does he call that a fair and reasonable opportunity of presenting our views to the people of this country? It is a mockery to call that discussion. Let me call your attention to one fact, which you may not be aware of, Mr. Speaker, but which you are entitled to be made aware of in order to judge correctly of the conduct of hon. members on this side of the House. I remember the first night, when the second clause of the Bill came up for discussion and the committee was called upon to consider whether the \$35,000,000 which it was proposed to vote—and with regard to which we made no question so far as the amount was concerned—should carry. There was an amendment which had been moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and which raised the question which has been agitating the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to a degree to which no other question since Confederation has agitated them—the question whether their taxes to the extent of \$35,000,000 should be sent across the water as a contribution to the Imperial Government or whether that money should be spent for the building up of a Canadian navy and encouraging the establishment of a great ship-building industry. We had been discussing that question for some two or three hours, when one o'clock arrived—a reasonable hour when the House should adjourn. The leader of the Opposition, in the most courteous manner, suggested to the leader of the Government that the time had arrived when the committee should rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. But the leader of the Government then announced, in as plain language as any language could be, that the committee would be compelled to sit until they passed that clause. And the right hon. gentleman calls that 'opportunity for reasonable discussion.' He said in effect that we must agree to pass that clause or otherwise we should be kept night and day until the next Sunday morning before he would let the committee rise. He did not say so in so many words, but that was his meaning. That is the way in which, as he says, he left the door open to 'fair and reasonable discussion' for the members of this House. And I am here to say that during that discussion, although hon. members on the other side did not favour the committee with their views, although they did not present any argument