

breach and will have to make a similar addition.

There is just one other point that I wish to put on 'Hansard,' which is quite different from this, but which may be required for reference. A great deal has been said about Australia constructing her ships. We have been frequently told that Canada should imitate Australia in the construction of ships. Australia has made but very small progress so far in that direction. She has built only a very few ships of the smallest kind, and some which she has constructed were brought almost wholly from Great Britain and merely put together in Australia. The last ship to join the Australian navy is the Melbourne. I have here the souvenir that commemorates the arrival of H.M.A.S. Melbourne at Port Phillip, on Wednesday, March 26, 1913. The souvenir says:

H. M. A. S. Melbourne was designed by Sir Phillip Watts, chief constructor of the navy, and built by Cammell, Laird & Co., at Birkenhead. With her speed and power the Melbourne may be regarded as the prototype of a new class of light cruisers. From the city which sponsored her, the Melbourne takes the motto, 'Vires Acquirit Eundo'—it gains strength as it goes.

Then follows the description of the Melbourne; not an enormous battleship, not a dreadnought at all. Even this small boat had to be built in Great Britain. This is the description:

Details:—Displacement, 5,600 tons; engines, Parsons turbine, developing 22,000 shaft H.P.; speed, 26 knots; length over all, 456 feet; beam 49 feet 10 inches; draught, 15 feet; armament, eight six inch guns, two torpedo tubes; complement, 390 officers and men. Commissioned at Brixenhead on January 18, 1913; left England on January 26; arrived Fremantle on March 10; Port Philip on March 26.

Mr. MACDONALD: Are not the Australian Government building a cruiser at the New South Wales dock now?

Mr. AMES: The Australians are attempting to build certain of their ships.

Mr. MACDONALD: Attempting?

Mr. AMES: Attempting to do so. They have had long and serious delays, and the ships launched, if I am rightly informed, are only of small class.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the sacrifice of freedom of speech is consummated in this House, before the arbitrary rule of closure is applied in all its monstrous mechanism, I desire to make a few observations to complete those I have already made on the same subject on the 9th of March last, by reason of the events which have occurred since that time.

Mr. AMES.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, before coming to the merit of the question, to draw your attention to the fact that since closure has been applied, it would seem as if the hon. members opposite had emerged from the silence which they have seen fit to observe since the 5th of December last. Have they found there another way to impose closure on the Opposition by taking away from us the few hours remaining for the discussion of that question? At the rate of 20 minutes for each member, 29 members of the Opposition would have the advantage to discuss this question during the present sitting; now, by breaking their silence, as the members opposite are now doing, a good many members of the Opposition are deprived of the privilege to speak. It would thus seem as if a new kind of closure was being imposed upon us.

However, those new tactics will perhaps procure us the advantage and the good luck to hear at last the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), who has been so conspicuous by his silence since the beginning of the session, and he will perhaps now see fit to explain his conduct. No better occasion could he find to follow the example set to him by several of his political friends before closure is applied.

After having struck out from the rules of the House the clause ensuring to the representatives of the people the right and liberty to discuss questions of public interest with all the necessary latitude, the Government now takes away from the Parliament of Canada, by this law under discussion, the power and the liberty to dispose of the public funds, according to the principles set forth in the Constitution. The Government also takes away from us the liberty to criticize the use of the public funds, to discuss the manner in which they are being employed in making to England that gift of thirty-five millions. Thirty-five millions! why, that is only a trifle for those hon. gentlemen who think nothing of sacrificing lands valued at \$374,000 for \$10, for the benefit of political friends; that is only a trifle for those hon. gentlemen who think nothing of buying clocks costing \$920 each. While I am at it, let me say they should have put one of those clocks in this House, where it would have been so useful in measuring the time during which each member is allowed to speak.

Thirty-five millions! that is only a trifle for those gentlemen who do not see that, in so doing, they are pledging the credit of the country, without Parliament being able to exercise the least control on the application of that money. Thirty-five millions! why, but that represents an annual interest of \$1,500,000, and we take as a basis the population as given by the last census, say seven millions of inhabitants, you can see that we have then a tax per capita of \$5