

Palma matches in Ottawa the Yankee soldiers popped in two bull's-eyes to our one every time, and the United States soldiers were enabled to dodge the tricky winds which put our men out of the match, because they were able to fire twice as rapidly as we could. The aperture sight is the only one of any efficiency in active service.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE: Is the aperture sight as used on the Ross rifle capable of being used in active service?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly, that is what we are making them for.

Mr. SHARPE: Are they used in active service?

Mr. HUGHES: We have never had a chance to have a crack at anybody since they were adopted.

Mr. SHARPE: Are they used in the Militia corps?

Mr. HUGHES: Certainly. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) last year went down to Halifax with his team and won all before him; on that occasion the aperture sight was used. Rifles fitted with this sight have not been used in active service, as I have said, because we have never had a chance of so demonstrating them. I can assure my hon. friend that if a time of trouble comes he will have an opportunity of putting this sight to the test in active service, and then he will see the efficiency of it, and be enabled to realize the benefits of the aperture sight when firing at an enemy as compared with the open sight. The hon. gentleman tried to pop at a target one day through an aperture sight, and he did very well for a novice, but when he tackled an old and experienced rifleman he fell far short of the mark.

The soldiers of Canada have thirty-five thousand of these rifles with aperture sights; we have them all over the Dominion, they are being attached to mark 2 and mark 3 rifles. As to the United States rifle, I do not wish to depreciate its value, but their aperture sight is not in it with ours for active service. Our aperture sight is part and parcel of the rifle; it is not a detachment, and in this we differ from the British people. As I have said, the British people have an opportunity of using the aperture sight, but the War Office will not let them.

Mr. MACDONALD: How does the minister account for this action on the part of the War Office?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know; I am not running the War Office; I am endeavouring to struggle along with the Canadian Militia Department.

Mr. GRAHAM: We believe, I suppose, in autonomy in rifles, anyway.

Mr. HUGHES: If the British Government would adopt a rifle which is equal to the Ross rifle, I would be delighted to conform with their practice and use it, but they have not yet done so.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend is taking the same exceptions to the instructions of the War Office that we took to the advice of the First Lord of the Admiralty last winter.

Mr. MACDONALD: I should like to say a word or two on this subject.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think this motion permits of a second speech on the part of any hon. gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD: As a matter of preserving my own right, perhaps, more than from any desire to inflict a speech upon the House, I would not care to give any assent to the proposition that an hon. gentleman moving a motion of this kind has not a right to close the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understand the matter correctly, a motion to adjourn the House does not permit the hon. gentleman who moved that motion to speak again.

Hon. SAM. HUGHES: So far as I am personally concerned, I should be very glad if the House would permit the hon. member to speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to paragraph 2 of Rule 21:

A reply shall be allowed to a member who has moved a substantive motion or the second reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an order of the day, not being the second reading of a Bill, an amendment, the previous question, an adjournment during a debate, or an instruction to a committee.

Clearly my hon. friend is entitled to a reply on this motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have always understood that in the case of a substantive motion the privilege was granted to the mover in order that he might answer the arguments that had been brought up after his first speech. It may be that the House regards this as a purely substantive motion. If that be so, the hon. member would have a right to reply. I have always understood