

and made his pronouncement in Montreal: I will submit this proposition to Parliament and, if Parliament does not agree to it, I will appeal from Parliament to the people of Canada. I would like to know if the right hon. gentleman proposes to do that in the event of Parliament not approving of this proposal. Whether he does it or not, let us get down to the question of what is the best thing to do for the Empire and for Canada. I have no hesitation in stating that to vote and expend money under the Naval Service Act is far better for Canada and the Empire than to vote and expend \$35,000,000 under the Naval Aid Act put through this Parliament by force of closure. The sentiment, so far as the expenditure of the money is concerned, is absolutely dead and gone. Surely my right hon. friend and every gentleman on the opposite side of the House knows that, so far as any enthusiastic sentiment behind this proposition is concerned, it is dead, finished, buried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take care.

Mr. GERMAN: It cannot further exist. Parliament should proceed under the Act which is at present on the statute book, ask for an appropriation and advertise for tenders for building the ships. If we can build them in Canada, we want them built here. I am quite sure my right hon. friend would be glad to see a large ship-building industry built up in Canada, whether in Halifax, Montreal, St. John or on the Welland canal, it would make no difference. I am sure every loyal Canadian citizen would like to see such an industry built up here. Then why not begin now to do it? The first ships, the ships that you require immediately, if they are required immediately, need not necessarily be built in Canada. It is proposed to build three dreadnoughts. I do not think three are at all necessary; I think it would be equally effective, so far as the object lesson to the world is concerned, if two were provided, and it would fit in with the naval proposition of Canada of two fleet units. As I said yesterday, it is not a question of money, it is not a question of the building of the ships, whether one, two, three or four; it is a question of the sentiment behind the gift, it is a question of the sentiment behind the proposition. In 1910 we passed an Act which is on the statute book to which my right hon. friend the leader of the Government agreed, except one clause, and I am free to admit that he did criticize that, and to that point I will come in a minute. He and every hon. member opposite then in the House agreed to that Bill. Then, why not proceed under that Bill at present? My right hon. friend voted for referring it to the people, at the instance of his

former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), who moved that this should be done. Having voted for that proposition at that time, I do not see how the right hon. gentleman can get away from submitting his proposal to the people. He is not proposing to do it at present, until it is thrown out by Parliament; and he has said that if and when it is thrown out by Parliament, he will submit it to the people. We shall see whether he will do so or not. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) suggests that I should ask the right hon. gentleman whether he will or not. I will not ask him that question, because I am sure he would not answer; he has not arranged his permanent policy on that problem any more than he has on the naval problem. Now he is in this position: everything that could be done under the Naval Aid Bill as it is before us can be done under the Naval Service Act. I ask my right hon. friend again why he is desirous of forcing through Parliament the Naval Aid Act. We oppose the Naval Aid Act because on the face of it it places the expenditure of public money in the hands of the Governor in Council as against the control of Parliament, which is subversive, as I have said, of every principle of responsible government. My right hon. friend last night dealt with that subject to some extent. I do not intend to go into it now, because I hope to have another opportunity to discuss that feature of the matter when this Bill comes up for third reading. A motion on the third reading will be in order notwithstanding the closure rules; we will take a chance on it anyway. The right hon. gentleman does not tell why he wants this Bill passed when everything that can be done under it can be done under the Naval Service Act. Perhaps some other hon. member would tell me; perhaps the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) would tell me. I know the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) could not, because they were not in the game at that time. It is the right hon. the leader of the Government, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) and the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk). They were the gentlemen who fixed it up. They can tell us why we are not proceeding under the Naval Service Act. They know. But, though I was not present at the meetings, I can easily appreciate what took place. The Nationalists were opposed to a naval service of any kind, they refused to vote money, or build ships, or do anything else in aid of the naval service of the British Empire. The right hon. the leader of the Government thought that he could secure a certain