

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—*Con.*

slur on Canadian manufacturers. Do not let any body forget the speaker at present time is sitting on a chair made by a Canadian manufacturer. I want the Liberals to look at that chair and see there the Canadian emblem—the Maple Leaf—Canada's coat of arms, with the British lions as sentinels and everything that points to a true Canadian product, 544. If some gentlemen are nailing their colours to the mast of reciprocity I want to nail my colours to the mast of adequate protection for Canada. I am here representing the artisan, the fruit grower, the farmer, the vegetable grower, and the manufacturer and I can stand on any platform and still say that I stand by my old leader Sir John A Macdonald, 545. The conservation of our water powers. Better transportation. Hydro-electric power development. The navy question. We should do what this country should have done years ago. The protection of the British navy means the protection of British subjects on land or on sea. We are all under the protection of the British navy, the efficiency of which means the peace of the world, 546.

Adjournment of the House.

Motion—Mr. Beland 7839.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister)—7844.

This very question was debated between the right hon. gentleman and myself some few years ago. He took the position that there is a distinct difference between a motion to adjourn when no debate is in progress and when a debate is in progress, 7844. Manifestly inconvenient and undesirable to introduce in the midst of a debate a motion with regard to it conveying censure upon a member of the administration, 7845. If Mr. Oliver desires to proceed he can do so to-morrow, 7846.

Graham, Hon. G. P. (Renfrew South)—7845.

During the past two weeks we have had some peculiar rulings by temporary chairmen. Record of 10th March read, 7846-7.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)—7843.

Matter correctly stated by Speaker. It only remains for us to determine what are our rights under the rules as laid down, 7843. Contradictory rulings perplex us and we should have an authoritative statement as to what our rights are, 7844. Henceforth it will be the rule that upon a motion to adjourn we are confined to the question then before the House. Upon a previous occasion the House ruled quite against this decision, 7850.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)—7839.

I wish to say something on a matter that concerns the administration of the lands of Canada, 7839. Proposition of Prime Minister satisfactory, 7848.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE—*Con.*

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)—7840.

Very great latitude is given to a member on making a motion of this character, 7840. It is competent for the hon. gentleman to give reasons why the adjournment should take place, 7843.

Speaker, His Honour the—7839.

Discussion on that subject not permissible now. If it is a matter of urgency there is a provision in the rules for bringing it up. Reads rule 39, 7839-40. No question about the propriety of the motion to adjourn the House, 7840. Not permissible to discuss any question other than the reasons for moving the adjournment and the question immediately before the House, 7843. The discussion might properly be confined either to giving reasons why the House should adjourn or to the original motion, 7847. Authorities quoted, 7849.

ADJOURNMENT—ASCENSION DAY.

Motion.

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday next, 30th instant, it stands adjourned to Friday next, 2nd May.—Mr. Borden, 8739.

ADMIRALTY ORDERS FOR CANADA.

Attention called to a despatch.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 951.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister)—952.

Was under the impression that Mr. Asquith was alluding to what he had stated in his speech that the Admiralty are prepared to give orders for the construction in Canada of some small ships. Did not vouch for the press reports of Asquith's observations. Beyond question that whatever he did say is absolutely in conformity with the fact, 951. The assurance has been given we rely upon it, and have no doubt that it will be carried out, 952. Was authorized to make the statement that was made in the House, and that is all the information he was able to give at the moment, 953.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Quebec East)—951.

Calls Premier's attention to a despatch from London which appears in the 'Citizen.' Reads despatch. This states positively that Mr. Asquith said that besides the agreement we have now under consideration, there is another which has not yet been submitted to the House. Noticed when the Premier made his speech the other day he had made several vague statements. Understood from it that nothing definite had been agreed upon. Suppose that if there had been a concrete understanding, it would have been brought before the House: Would like to know if the despatch was accurate, 952. If these arrangements are vague and not reduced to writing