

The hon. gentleman, in speaking of the various Bills to which he had objected—Government Bills, which were so affected by the action of this Senate as to become of no effect—went very largely into the constitutional aspect, as being the reason why he objected to the passing of these Bills. The Highways Bill and the Naval Bill were amongst the others. I could not help noticing, and I am quite sure many members of this hon. body noticed, that the course of the hon. gentleman's speech yesterday in this connection appeared to be one long apology for the action which he had taken with regard to those Bills at the last session. He seemed to be troubled somewhat in his conscience over the acts which he had done. He had the opportunity of throwing out the Highways Bill twice, and I believe he suggested the Government should send up the Naval Aid Bill, I presume so that he could have the opportunity of throwing it out the second time. The Government showed good judgment and a great amount of common sense in determining that they were not coming to Parliament to play the game of battledore and shuttlecock as between the House of Commons and the Senate in this Parliament of Canada. Having had those two important Bills rejected by the Senate, one of them twice and the other once, they showed good judgment in not sending them up again to be defeated in a similar manner.

In speaking of naval matters, the hon. gentleman referred to the Naval resolution of 1909, which was unanimously passed by the House of Commons. I had the honour of being present, and was one of those who voted in favour of that resolution at that time. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the resolution, which was carried and voted on unanimously by the House of Commons, was not the resolution which was introduced by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Sir Wilfrid introduced a resolution which did not appeal to the members of the Opposition, and, at the suggestion of the hon. Mr. Borden, the then leader of the Government, changed his resolution so that it read differently from the one which he introduced. I am not going to read those resolutions, but I am just going to point out where they differ in one or two respects. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's original Motion stated in the first clause that:

Hon. Mr. DANIEL.

Under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the Imperial treasury for naval or military purposes, would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution to the question of defence.

How is that section put in the resolution that was carried? They read very much alike, but there is a very important difference. The resolution was passed in the following form:

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, as far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

There is an important difference there. And there is also this other portion of the resolution to which I shall call attention later. I am speaking of the resolution unanimously passed, which reads as follows:

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the views that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce and the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

The last Naval Conference was in 1909. As far as that resolution goes we were united in the other House. We would have been united to-day if the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in the Naval Bill which he brought in and passed through the House of Commons, and which was also passed by this Chamber, had carried out that resolution of 1909, which I have just read. Wherein does it differ? The resolution stated that any naval action taken under the Act should be the arrangement and institution of a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference. Now was that done? I say certainly it was not done and I will show you just exactly where and the particulars in which I think it was not done.

What was the suggestion of the Admiralty at that Conference? I do not refer to all the suggestions, but just to one or two. In the first place they stated that:

If the problem of Imperial naval defence were considered merely as a problem of naval