

pen in the case of that ship? The First Minister is considering whether he will take part in the war or not. What flag does that ship fly in the meantime? The British flag? Then, if so, the first ship of the enemy that comes near her, lets into her and down she goes. But suppose those on board do not know what flag to fly—Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his cabinet have not decided whether they are going to let us fight or not. Of course, the boys are always ready to fight; but suppose even it is decided not to fight, and the flag is taken down. What is the position of that ship? She is a common pirate; and not only the enemy's ships but the ships of every nation would be bound to capture her, for that is the law of nations. In war or peace our ships must fly the Union Jack or nothing. And, as I have said, our intention is that the Union Jack shall fly. The First Minister has spoken of responsible government, and his word is being repeated. Now, I would like to point out that the policy of the leader of the opposition maintains the policy of responsible government, and the policy enunciated by the First Minister departs from that principle. A few years ago, this country freely voted a sum of money—I think it was \$250,000—to the relief of the poor in Ireland. Would any one maintain that because of that vote we were under tribute to Ireland? At a later time we voted money to San Francisco—did that mean that we were under tribute to the United States? We voted money to relieve the sufferers in Sicily: were we departing from the principles of responsible government in doing so?

Mr. HARTY. And to France the other day.

Mr. HUGHES. We voted \$50,000 to France the other day—a splendid country. I wish some of our hon. friends opposite had as sound ideas of freedom as they have in France in many things.

Mr. FIELDING. Have not we French domination? I have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) say that.

Mr. HUGHES. Never.

Mr. FIELDING. I apologize. I have heard it stated that we were suffering from French domination.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a wing of the French element which is trying to make us suffer, but fortunately there is another wing that tries to keep things in proper shape. Will any one say that because of the vote given to France the other day, we are subject to the domination of France? Not for an instant. We were standing by the principle of responsible government in every one of these votes. We appropriate money for the exhibitions in foreign coun-

tries—hundreds of thousands. Are we then, subject to the domination of Belgium and these countries to which we send our officers with our exhibits? We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for lighthouses and other means of protection for the commerce of the world on our coasts. Are we subject to the nations that are thus benefited? No. The money was freely voted. In voting it, we stand by the principle of responsible government, and we seek no subterfuge, and make no equivocation. But what is the position of the government, as we find in the speech of the First Minister? They are quoted in many parts of the country as being in favour of helping the motherland, but when we come to analyse them, you find that the ship he is proposing does not fly the British flag. And what is going on in Quebec to-day? Why, it is whispered about: 'Never mind; vote this money; it is all right; it means Canadian independence.' The First Minister tells us that he is accused on both sides—accused of being too loyal, and accused of not being loyal enough. But there is no question as to our position—we are standing by the principles of responsible government, and we are not obtaining the money for our policy by false pretenses. Under our policy Canada would have a voice in the councils of the empire, because Canada, having contributed these ships to the navy, would be represented on the imperial defence committee, and her voice would be heard, not only in the management of the ships, but on the question of war or peace. Our policy is a policy for the whole empire, and not a policy for Canada alone.

There are four or five ways in which Canada could have helped the motherland in this extremity, and of those four or five ways the government has chosen the worst possible way from Canada's own point of view or the point of view of the empire. The first policy is that of the government of Canada having a navy no matter where it is bought, controlled by Canada—and we know what that means—which may or it may not be loaned. There is the policy of the government in a nutshell, and as I pointed out before, the British flag is not necessarily the flag that floats over that navy.

The second policy is that proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), a direct contribution in the meantime, and then we will be prepared to fight out at the polls whether the policy of the government is the one that should be upheld or not. That policy would fly the Union Jack.

The third policy would be that outlined by the admiralty, an imperial navy with docks, naval schools, training ships, etc., in Canada, so that whether we confederat-