

New Zealand, to the shores of Australia, or to any part of the world without the enemy being aware of what they are doing. It is absolutely necessary if the navy is to be made effective that that secret information should be available to the British Admiralty in the direction of the British fleet. If you take away that advantage you interfere to a large extent with the effectiveness of the British navy. If we tried to operate a little navy of our own entirely independent of the British navy, what would happen? Have we any well thought out plan as to what we would do in regard to that? Suppose that Parliament was called together, in the event of war being declared, and suppose that we succeeded in getting the hon. member for St. John to consent to Canada's participation in the war, and that we sent our navy across the Atlantic. Would it be entirely under the control of the officer in charge, would it start out, entirely upon his initiative, to conduct a little fight independent of the British fleet, or would that navy come under one central authority, one head, who would guide and direct the whole affair. Must we keep up this separatist idea that we must absolutely manage our own navy or else lose our independence? I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, that there has ever been very much in the claim that is made that in some way we will lose our autonomy if we make a grant such as we have under contemplation, if we construct three battle-ships and loan them to the British navy for the time being. How that could effect our autonomy I am unable to see. I am willing that hon. gentlemen opposite shall have their opinion but I wish to have mine. It has been said that they are following the example of the Conservative party when the reciprocity question was under consideration two years ago. I wish to flatly deny that proposition. We acted entirely inside the rules of the House when we discussed the question of reciprocity. We know that on the second reading of a Bill, the whole debate must take place, or ought to take place, and we debated the reciprocity proposition entirely on the second reading of the Bill when every man had an opportunity to speak once, and once only. During that debate not a single rule of this House was violated. No member spoke more than once on the question, and many of them did not speak at all. I do not deny the right of every member of this House to speak once upon a great question of that kind, but what have hon. gentlemen opposite done? When the naval proposition was brought down they engaged in a little discussion, and there was a reasonable amount of discussion upon the second reading, but when we reached the clauses in committee, contrary to the rules of the House and to every principle of parliament-

Mr. WRIGHT

ary procedure, they wanted to make a general debate. They discussed the matter from Dan to Beersheba. From the moment we commenced the discussion of the clauses of the Bill there was not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who stayed within the rules, and when the slightest attempt was made to bring them inside the rules they raised a row. They were not amenable to any rules of debate, but I think the great public of the Dominion of Canada will have a proper conception of the attitude adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. If they have it in their minds that the public are in sympathy with them in the actions they have taken in this matter there will be a rude awakening some of these days for them. The action they have taken has been such as to bring the greatest amount of comfort and consolation to every enemy not only of Great Britain but of every part of the British Empire. There is not a pro-Boer or a Fenian sympathiser who is not delighted at the action of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have taken such action as is calculated to give the greatest possible satisfaction to every enemy of Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): I wish to call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) on the 8th of April, last, in which he quoted from a speech delivered by the First Lord of the Admiralty, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill, to the effect that the ships that the Government of Canada propose to build and to give, or transfer, to the Admiralty would not be an addition to the Imperial fleet, but would fill the gap in that fleet which, if not filled by Canada, would have to be filled by ships built by the Admiralty themselves. The Minister of Finance, on the 6th day of this month, quoted at greater length from the speech delivered by the First Lord of the Admiralty, on the 31st of March, in the British House of Commons, along the same lines. It appears to me that the Minister of Finance thoroughly approved of the position taken by the First Lord of the Admiralty. I wish to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government, if and when these ships are built, to transfer them to the Admiralty under the conditions outlined by the First Lord as quoted by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the Bill itself contains the answer to my hon. friend's inquiry. The Bill states that the ships are to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course, the Prime Minister has a greater knowledge of this Bill than I have. I think he sees my point