

that he could not get a voice in the foreign policy of the Empire, he was bound by the pledges he had given to the Nationalists of Quebec not to proceed under the Naval Service Act. He was then forced to do something, and so he conjured up an emergency. If it would be wrong to give a series of contributions when there is no emergency, it would be wrong to give even one contribution, for the principle is the same? In my judgment there is only one honourable way out of the difficulty into which the Government has got in consequence of its alliance with the Quebec Nationalists, and in consequence of the pledges that were given before the last election, and that is to implement the promise given by the Prime Minister in the city of Montreal last summer and in this House on the 5th of December last, and allow the people to decide this matter.

Under the conditions I have myself pointed out, I do not think the Government can expect the Senate to pass this Bill. If it were for no other reason than the statement of the Prime Minister that to give a contribution to the Imperial Admiralty, before we would have a voice in the management of the foreign policy of the Empire would be intolerable, the Senate would be justified in rejecting this Bill. I repeat that statement of the Prime Minister would alone be sufficient to justify the Senate of Canada refusing to pass this Bill. Added to that, there is the condition of things admirably pointed out by the hon. member for Welland; that this legislation and practically all the legislation introduced this session by the Government is introduced with the object of taking away from the Parliament of Canada and consequently from the people of Canada, in some measure at least, the control over public expenditure, and giving that control to the Governor in Council. That principle is contained in the Highways Bill; it is to some extent in the Agricultural Bill, and it is to a very great extent in this Bill, although it has been modified to some extent by the clause proposed by the Prime Minister last night.

The Prime Minister and some of his followers have said that the memorandum obtained from the First Lord of the Admiralty, stating how much better the ships could be built in Great Britain than in Canada, and how much better we could be defended by the Imperial navy than by anything we could do ourselves, is a justification for the policy of the Government. Mr. Chairman, there are two schools of thought in Great Britain; there always has been two schools of thought there, and not confined to any one political party. Some Liberals and many Conservatives appear to be under the impression that they could protect and defend the overseas dominions to a much greater extent than these dominions could

protect and defend, and even govern themselves. The enforcement of the principles of that school of thought, caused the loss of the original Thirteen Colonies and was responsible for bringing about a civil war in Canada in 1837. No doubt it would have brought about many other difficulties and troubles, were it not that the British people, by their experience in the Revolutionary war in the United States, had learned a lesson. In the Empire of Rome, and in Spain, there was the same school of thought—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the point.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.): That may appear so, but I am saying that the school of thought which finds disciples in Winston Churchill and other Englishmen, leads these gentlemen to believe that they could attend to the first duties of citizenship much better than we can ourselves, and that they could better govern this country than we can, leaving to us the more menial occupations of manual labour. The Prime Minister and many of his supporters seem to have cast in their lot with that school. But, Sir, I contend that no public man can go before the people of Canada and tell them plainly that he believes in that principle. I do not believe the people of Canada would stand for it for a minute. I want to tell the minister now, as it probably will be the last opportunity I shall have of saying anything on this measure, that the path of honour and the path of duty for him, and the best way to get out of his awkward position, is to follow the promise he gave on the 5th of December in this House, when he said that if he did not get for this Bill the support from Parliament which he expected, he would dissolve the House and go to the country. The right hon. gentleman also made that statement in Montreal on the 21st of September, and next day there appeared in the Montreal Star the following article strongly supporting him in that declaration:

Mr. Borden recurred on Saturday night to his pledge to appeal to the people if Parliament refused to endorse what he regarded as a patriotic and creditable policy.

This is a pledge which may well be applied to other hindrances than a positive refusal to adopt a sufficient policy.

Wanton obstruction should be met in the same fashion. We cannot allow unnecessary delay; for, in a case of this sort, time is of the essence of the contract.

Fair and free discussion there must be. If the addition to the fleet of Canadian ships be decided upon, it will be a big thing which Parliament will propose; and Parliament ought to be allowed to debate it fully, and the country should be given adequate time for consideration. But no interest will suffer if Mr. Borden keeps the fact constantly before Parliament that, after all, the people are the final arbiters in this case, and that any refusal by Parliament to act—whether by

Mr. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.).