

The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) asked a question regarding the Sault Ste. Marie dry dock, a question which I am bound to say was unusual, I would not like to say offensive, because if it is offensive, it probably was unconsciously so on my hon. friend's part. He asked if a statement I made with regard to the action of the government in reference to the Sault Ste. Marie dry dock was true, and he referred to some statement contained in a newspaper that an order in council had been passed deciding to grant assistance to the dry dock. I may say to my hon. friend that I have nothing to add to or take from what I said previously. The formal application has not yet come before the government; it will not come before council until the report of the engineer is ready and no order has been passed and no action taken with regard to the subsidy to this dock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Minister of Finance whether or not there are to be any supplementary estimates, and, if so, when it is likely they will be brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. The supplementary estimates for the current year are being prepared at this moment. As to the supplementaries for the coming year, I am not in a position at the present to answer my hon. friend's question. It would be some little time before they could be brought down if there are to be any. The supplementaries for the current year will be brought down at an early day.

#### NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, I had the honour last evening of occupying the time of the House for a few minutes with the discussion of this question, and I think I can promise the House that I shall not occupy very much time this afternoon. But, coming from a maritime district, as I do, in fact, coming from the farthest western constituency in Canada, I think it is incumbent on me as a member for that particular district, to have a view on this question and to be prepared to put that view before this House. Last night I made some reference to the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), who preceded me, and I wish to make further reference to one or two things to which that gentleman attached great importance in connection with the policy of the government, which is now before the

Mr. PUGSLEY.

House. I wish to make a very important and very necessary correction to one argument advanced by my hon. friend last evening. He stated that perhaps the most mischievous and most insidious feature of the government Bill was an attempt, a veiled and unpatriotic attempt, to change the relations of Canada to the motherland. By section 15 of the British North America Act the Commander in Chief of all the armed forces in Canada is declared to continue to be vested in the Crown, and my hon. friend went on to explain that in his opinion the constitution of this country, section 15 of the British North America Act, was very seriously interfered with, and that the policy of the government presented to the House and to the country made no provision for retaining the authority of the Crown with regard to the operation of the naval or land forces of the empire or of Canada. My hon. friend, by this argument, simply announced to the House that he had not read the Bill before the House, for section 4 of the Bill provides exactly according to the terms and the very words of section 15 of the British North America Act. I shall read the two sections, as I did last evening, in my hon. friend's absence, because he attached such supreme importance to the position that he was taking. As a matter of fact, it appeared to those of us who listened to my hon. friend as if he had made a very important discovery. This matter had not been mentioned by any of the leading members of the opposition, and it did really appear from the attitude of my hon. friend that he had a very important discovery, and that the government, in providing for this policy, was actually destroying the constitution of Canada, and forever interfering with the harmony that ought to exist between Canada and the motherland.

The section in the British North America Act to which he referred, reads:

The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

Or in the Crown, if you like. I shall now read the section in the Bill before the House:

The command in chief of the naval forces is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty, or by the Governor General as His representative.

He concluded that this unconstitutional act was an evidence of the disposition of the government to bring about the breaking off of the alliance, that proper and reasonable, and staunch alliance between this country and the empire, and to lead this country out into the development of absolute independence and perhaps in the future absolute separation from the em-