

pire. That is the attitude assumed by my hon. friend, and the strongest evidence which he produced that the policy before the House showed such a disposition on the part of this government was the fact that in this Bill they had failed to provide for the carrying out of the British North America Act in regard to the authority of the Crown, in the control of the naval and military forces of Britain and of this country. Thus, it is of tremendous importance that this matter should be brought to the attention of this House, and that the correction should be made.

The next point, and about the only point of attack that my hon. friend made upon the policy of the government was in relation to the fact that in time of war it was necessary for the Governor in Council of this country to give instructions as to whether or not the naval or military forces should be sent to the protection of the British empire. My hon. friend thought that was a very serious omission. I do not know exactly where he meant to place the responsibility, you have to have responsibility somewhere. But my hon. friend's argument went to show the House and the country that the leading ministers of the Liberal party were not true to the traditions of the British empire, were trying to develop an absolutely independent nationality, and his reasoning led him to the necessity of objecting to that provision in the Act, whereby it is necessary for the Governor in Council to provide that the military or naval forces of this country should be sent to the aid of the empire in case of war. I submit that the conclusion of my hon. friend was purely a political conclusion.

Mr. COWAN. Does the hon. gentleman propose to read section 4, without reading section 18, or does he read section 18 into section 4, and if the Governor can act what is the necessity of an order in council under section 18?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am following my hon. friend's own argument. He complained last night that there was very serious danger in this country having to submit to the authority of the Governor in Council in case of hostilities occurring between Great Britain and any other nation, and he led up to that position by the announcement that he had no confidence in the leaders of this government, as he believed they tended to independence and separation. According to the conclusions of my hon. friend, he was deciding this question entirely on political grounds; because he had no confidence in the leaders of this government, he was afraid to depend upon them in such possible contingencies. I suppose my hon. friend would have no alarms at all if a Conservative

government were in power. That is the answer to the whole position taken by my hon. friend. If his friends were in power, the Governor in Council would be all right and the empire would be perfectly safe. The thought struck me at the moment that even in that case my hon. friend could not be very confident, in view of the attitude of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), a very important person in the political party of my hon. friend, whom every one might reasonably expect would be a prominent member of a Conservative ministry. Therefore it struck me that my hon. friend could not entirely depend on the security of the empire even if his own friends were in power. If there is any tendency to independence on the part of any minister of the Liberal government, it has been annulled by the denunciation of British diplomacy by the leader of the Conservative party from the province of Quebec; and under these circumstances it would be unreasonable for my hon. friend from Vancouver to expect to make the empire secure by having as one of the principal ministers in a Conservative government the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the hon. member for Nanaimo, before he leaves the merits of the question, to answer the questions I put to him, and further to tell me what would be the result if no order in council were passed under section 18?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. My answer to my hon. friend is simple. As I said, he controverted two things in the policy of the government last night. He said that the government were destroying the constitution of this country—that the authority over the forces of this country was provided in the British North America Act to be vested in the King, whereas there was no provision in the Bill of the government for such a condition? I have demonstrated to the House that in that my hon. friend is mistaken. The other position taken by my hon. friend was that if hostilities broke out between Britain and another country, it would be a serious thing to depend on the authority of the Governor in Council in this country, especially as it is constituted at the present time. Now, I am not contending against any legal interpretation that my hon. friend may put upon the Bill, now that he is in cold blood and sober senses; but I am replying to statements made by my hon. friend when he was a little excited; and if his statements cannot bear cold criticism, that is not my fault. What I am doing is criticising what my hon. friend has said, and I am doing it without prejudice and without feeling, as I have nothing but the best feeling for my hon. friend; but on an important question like this, the decision of members of this