

the Conservative party is committed, means a closer alliance between Canada and Great Britain, and the position taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House means just the opposite. That is the germ of the whole situation, and I maintain that the opposition of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition to this Bill is in line with his whole conduct as a public man in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. EDWARDS: He has announced himself—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Stick to clause 2.

Mr. EDWARDS: I maintain, Sir, that is the reason why this Bill is being opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. In conclusion, I wish to say that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition has opposed this Bill because he wants to lessen the moral effect which this grant of \$35,000,000 will have upon the countries of the world. That is the position taken by the Opposition. It is a position of separation, of getting away, of dividing. It is all very well for the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, when speaking in Toronto, to throw out one or two sentences in order to catch the people of Ontario, but he is on record in 'Hansard' time and again, and also across the line, as having announced himself in favour of separation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order. Take it back. Time.

The CHAIRMAN: The time of the hon. member has expired.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) asked if it would be wise to establish a shipyard in Canada for the purpose of building dreadnoughts, as only two or three were to be built. The object in establishing shipyards in this country is to encourage the building of commercial ships. The large commercial ships plying to-day between here and England, and in fact some of those that ply on the great lakes, are practically as large as dreadnoughts. That is a good reason for establishing shipyards capable of building dreadnoughts. In connection with that I would like to read a little memorandum that came under my eyes last night, that during the last twelve years there were built for the great lakes two hundred and ten ships costing \$25,000,000, of which amount \$18,000,000 has been spent in other countries for ships used in our carrying trade. That is one reason why we wanted to encourage ship-building and the laying down of shipyards in this country by commencing with the building of a Canadian navy. We did not expect that the shipyards would continue to build battleships. Many people who

Mr. EDWARDS.

have discussed this question have told us that there is no reason why we should not build up a great ship-building industry, at least in the Maritime provinces.

My hon. friend from Frontenac says: Why did you not encourage ship-building? the observations which I have just made will be an answer to him—that we were endeavouring to encourage ship-building when we brought in our Naval Bill. He asks: Why did you buy the Rainbow and the Niobe? We bought them for use as training ships? It was absolutely necessary, according to our programme, that we should train men to man our ships when built, and it was also absolutely necessary that we should commence at once.

Speaking of the Opposition in this House, my hon. friend said that if all governments were carried on in the face of such opposition as we are putting up against this Bill, it would have to be a matter of compromise. All government by the people must be a matter of compromise. Is there any other possible way of democratic government? He says quite truly that we on this side of the House have a voice in the affairs of the country and have a right to have it.

Mr. GRAHAM: On everything, of course, except the rules.

Mr. NESBITT: All that we on this side of the House ask and have asked is the right to have a voice in everything that goes on in this Parliament. My hon. friend also says that they on that side of the House have a right to have a voice in the affairs of the country. We have never denied them that right. He says: If the Opposition becomes so keen that we cannot pass this Bill, what ought the Government to do seeing that we have thirty or forty more members than you have? If they think they are right according to all constitutional democratic government, they know what they can do: they can appeal to the people who sent us all here. No opposition would dare oppose after the people had pronounced on the question. My hon. friend spent about half his time in discussing my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). As my hon. friend from St. John is quite capable of taking care of himself, I need not attempt to defend him.

I for one am very much disappointed that this Bill should still be under discussion here. When the right hon. the leader of the Government and his ministers came back from England, after having been impregnated more or less with the inflammatory spirit that seems to be instilled into the English people, and after having been surrounded by naval and military officers, I was not surprised that they thought it necessary to make this grant of \$35,000,000. After having been in this country for six or eight months, and got