

Union Jack, and yet practically rest quiescent on the waves until she gets an order in council to know whether she is to attack the enemy of Great Britain or not. It is a simply impossible position. The Prime Minister has quoted—rather unfortunately for himself, I think—the case of the Japanese flotilla taking the Russian fleet, which would not put itself into action until actually attacked. If we follow the example of Russia in this case we shall be wiped off the seas as she was. He has referred to the war in Egypt, and also to the war in the Crimea. I think the case of Egypt was a rather unhappy illustration, for Canada sent the Canadian voyageurs, did she not?

Mr. TALBOT. Not at that time

Mr. BURRELL. It may have been at another time. But the Prime Minister's contention is that in the case of a war with Great Britain or any other power, there should be authority in the parliament of Canada, and the Governor in Council to decide whether that war is of sufficient importance for Canada to take part in it or not. He does not seem to take into consideration the moral effect upon other nations of our hesitating, and discussing when Great Britain is at war. The British navy, is the great safeguard of the empire, on which the defence of the integrity of the empire—which the Prime Minister sometimes seems to think so anxious should be defended—depends. Does not he think that those most likely to know whether assistance is necessary or not, are the central authorities of the admiralty, and that we could safely leave to those authorities in Great Britain to say whether they want our assistance or not instead of limiting in this cumbrous roundabout way, leaving it to the Governor in Council, and to the Canadian parliament involving serious delay? If we could trust those who are in authority in the councils of the empire at all, surely we could trust them to say whether they want our assistance or not. They would not call upon Canada to send their vessels unless Great Britain's supremacy were threatened. The Prime Minister says that if Britain's supremacy were threatened, the Governor in Council, and this parliament would decide to go to her assistance. But he does not seem to realize that, in naval wars in these times, after such a discussion it might be too late to do any good. For my part then, it is inconceivable that any part of the British empire, Canada, Australia, New Zealand or any other flying the British flag, should, in case of war, stand on one side until the question has been threshed out whether we should take part or not. And, if we are not to fly that flag, the sooner we know it the better.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Burrell) a question. In the event of the Canadian navy being placed at the disposal of Great Britain, would it be Canada that would have to provide the money that would purchase the supplies and ammunition necessary to operate these vessels?

Mr. BURRELL. I dare say it might. But I do not think the question is very much to the point. My hon. friend (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) knows perfectly well what the British attitude was in the Boer war—they gave a pretty generous supply. The hon. member's question would reduce it to the argument that we who pay for the ships should have the final say—reducing it to a matter of dollars, altogether too low a level, in my opinion, when the supremacy of the British empire is challenged. I do not think these questions would arise, and I do not think they are relevant.

Mr. MACDONALD. Of course, the hon. member may propose to wipe away with a wave of his hand what might mean millions to the Canadian people. But he forgets that a parliament exists in England in which a ministry has to be consulted before war is declared. The principle upon which that right is exercised through government is at the very base of governmental administration everywhere for the government must provide the funds to carry on the war. The hon. gentleman says that in Canada it is a matter of indifference who is to pay the money necessary to operate the navy. But we must be practical. We cannot soar into realms of patriotism and forget that war is an intensely practical matter in which blood and money are concerned. If Canada is to supply the men and the ships, she must supply money before the force can be operated. And, if the money is to be supplied by Canada, how is it to be obtained except by executive act of the government of the day supplemented by parliament. And, if the government has to act, this section of the Bill is absolutely necessary in order that the power committed to the executive of the day to determine whether the necessary supply shall be given may be exercised. That is the case with the British government, and the enactment before us is neither more nor less than placing in this law the same principle that has guided the administration of affairs in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not know that the government could get money by executive action. I thought it was a matter of parliamentary appropriation. The hon. member (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) seems to be introducing a new constitutional principle.