

number of votes in the province of Quebec and, he said to these gentlemen: Now, gentlemen, I will repeal the Naval Service Act; I will take no action under that; and before I do anything, I will submit my proposition to the people of Canada. If he had not said that Mr. Monk never would have gone into his Government. Mr. Monk left his Government because he would not submit his proposition to the people of Canada. So the ex-Minister of Public Works must have had an assurance before he went into the Government that before any policy, temporary or permanent, was submitted to Parliament that proposition or policy would be submitted to the people. When the right hon. leader of the Government said, I will bring in this emergency Bill, Mr. Monk left the Government. The other gentlemen retained their portfolios. The right hon. gentleman says this is a case of emergency. Well, when an emergency lasts from the 20th of November until the 8th of May and nothing serious happens, it is not a very dangerous emergency. If it continues in the same line we might as well not vote anything. The right hon. gentleman came back from England and said: I have some secret information, there is a great emergency and I must ask Parliament to vote \$35,000,000 at once, and if Parliament does not vote it immediately I will appeal to the great electorate and get their mandate to vote \$35,000,000. That was the way he talked in November last. We have gone on till now and nothing serious has happened. I say there never was an emergency; the right hon. gentleman knew there was not an emergency, because every minister of the Crown in Great Britain, including his particular friend the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, always said there was no emergency. Mr. Churchill was the strongest one of the whole British Cabinet to deny that there was an emergency. Still the right hon. gentleman asks us to vote \$35,000,000 and to carry through this measure although the Act now standing on the statute book will enable him to do everything he proposes to do under this Act. Why, then, is he doing it? I say with all sincerity, with the right hon. gentleman sitting in his place, that in my opinion he is doing it because he promised the Nationalists of Quebec that he would repeal the Naval Service Act, and when he introduced his permanent policy he would submit it to the people. What permanent policy can we have? There can be only one of two permanent policies, either a contribution to Great Britain in the way of building ships there and handing them over to Great Britain, or building ships of our own and having a Canadian navy. There is no middle course. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to suggest

Mr. GERMAN.

any other course. If it was necessary to make a contribution to Great Britain, which may be well enough in its way, we would do it but it is not necessary and it is not advisable. But it is either that or building ships ourselves. The Prime Minister has chosen the course of a contribution to Great Britain. That course we oppose, we oppose it for the reason we will not allow the Nationalists of the province of Quebec to dominate the Government of Canada and that is what they are doing at this moment. If this Naval Aid Act passes Parliament it will be a domination of this Government by the Nationalists of the province of Quebec. We on this side of the House, so far as we are able, will not allow that. That is one reason we are opposing it. The next reason we are opposing it is that the Government proposes to take from Parliament the control of the money which is expended in the building of these ships and the control of the ships after they are built. For these reasons I beg to move:

That clause 4 be amended by striking out all the words after the word 'the' in the second line thereof and adding the words 'subject to the provisions of the Naval Service Act.'

Mr. GEORGE E. McCRAVEY (Saskatoon): After a number of months of debate it is illuminating to refer to the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister, delivered on the 5th day of December, in which he used this language, which was serious in its import and which, if it was correct, imposed very onerous duties upon the people of Canada:

Today, while the clouds are heavy and we hear the booming of the distant thunder and see the lightning flashes above the horizon, we cannot and we will not wait and deliberate.

Whatever deliberating the Government have done in the meantime it is certain that they have not been talking much. Comparing that with the situation as it is to-day brings to our mind the fact that those conditions which so filled the imagination of the Premier on the 5th of December last do not exist now. The change had come even before the Minister of Trade and Commerce left for Australia because he felt it necessary to suggest to this House that there was some important secret information in the possession of the Prime Minister which he was not at liberty to disclose, but which, if it were in the possession of hon. members on this side would alter the situation completely and induce us to support the Bill. To-day we find that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, after he made his speech with this suggestion, went to Australia. He is there now, enjoying the banquets of the Australian people. He is, no doubt, admiring the splendid naval service that they are