

greatest danger of friction between Canada and the British Government? I think that is self-evident. Further, may I ask my hon. friend if he has thought out this constitutional difficulty? Under the British North America Act, clause 91, Canada is given exclusive power over militia and naval defence. Clause 91 of that act says:

The exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada extends to all matters coming within the classes of subjects next herein before enumerated, that is to say—(7) militia military, and naval service and defence.

We have under that Act, exclusive jurisdiction. I ask my hon. friend is he going to take the responsibility of surrendering part of the authority conferred upon the parliament of Canada by the British North America Act? We are giving over part of that authority when we agree to make conditions with His Majesty's government as to how this money shall be paid, used and applied. Has my hon. friend any authority to surrender part of that power? I do not think he has. It could only be surrendered by an amendment to the British North America Act. What we have we hold. What we have we cannot part with. It is ours to use, not to dispose of. Why should we delegate the power exclusively conferred on us. Let me take the converse of that—has the British Government the power to take over, by order in council, any of the powers conferred upon the parliament of Canada by the British North America Act? I do not think they have. In my judgment they could only constitutionally take over this power by an amendment to that Act. So I say we have two constitutional anomalies or defects in the Navy Bill—That Canada, beyond her right to do so, is surrendering part of her power, and the other, that the British government is getting power which she has no right to. Now, I am not afraid of the British government; for that matter I am not afraid of any government, if we only keep upon the watch-tower. But if you allow these innovations and concessions, where will they land you?

I am not going to set up very high standards of autonomy for anybody, nor am I going to be fastidious in regard to the exact claims of responsible government. There may be emergencies when we have to yield a little here and there. Indeed if there were no other way of meeting the present difficulties of defence, I would perhaps forego, if there were a real emergency, some of my convictions upon both points, because in danger everything must give way. There is no emergency in this case, so that we are not required to give away or surrender any of our constitutional rights.

No Permanent Navy.

The Bill before us does not provide for a permanent Naval force. To use the words of Mr. Foster "there are no bones in it, at least no Canadian bones, or flesh or blood or mental attitude. It is so many empty shells, a painted ship on a painted ocean so far as Canada is concerned." To quote Mr. Borden again in his speech on January 12th, 1910:

"I do not believe that it could endure. It would not be permanent or continuous."

3. The Bill makes no provision for training men for the Naval Service. One of the difficulties of the British Admiralty is to man the ships already built. Mr. Borden proposes to build a certain number