

look nice to see the Minister of Marine, who never served a day in the militia, going down and sailing one of those great big men of war around and telling them what to do, and the Minister of Militia sitting in his office afraid to go on board, because he has nothing to say about it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for the confidence which he seems to have in me, but I must say to him that I believe the method adopted is approved absolutely by the admiralty. I might say further than that, going back to 1898, when the Defence Committee was appointed to inquire into the defences of Canada, and an expert report describing the condition of the defences of Canada was made and submitted to the Colonial Defence Committee in England, and after it had been fully considered by the war office, and the admiralty, because it was referred to both, certain notes upon this report were sent to this government from the admiralty advising that if, and when a naval department should be established in Canada it should be placed under the Department of Marine and Fisheries, one of the reasons being that there existed already in that department a fisheries protection service which might be looked upon as the nucleus of a navy, and it would be decidedly in the public interest, and the admiralty itself should prefer that this course be taken. Now, I agree with my hon. friend—and it has been stated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister—that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is a very comprehensive one, and has a great many different branches and a great deal of work to do. That was the reason why a department of the naval service has been created as a separate department for the time being at any rate to be under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and in that naval department is included the services which were referred to by the admiralty as being the nucleus of the navy, namely, the fisheries protective service and two or three other services which properly belong to a department of this kind.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised at the minister making, as an excuse, the statement that the naval authorities in England were perfectly satisfied with the government deciding to put this under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Why should they object? They do not care what department it is put under, but now the minister states there will be separate department for this service. If the department is entirely separate from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, does the minister not think that he could have managed it just as well and have had all the militia business together in one de-

Mr. J. D. REID.

partment? I was surprised that the Prime Minister nudged the Minister of Militia to rise and reply to this instead of making his own excuse. I would have expected the Prime Minister to do that. I think the whole thing is a question of patronage. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have the patronage of all this service and he wanted to cut the Minister of Militia out of a little of this patronage and give it to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That, I think is why it was put under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It does not seem right to me, and I have heard many people wondering why this was done. The people of Canada would like to know from the Prime Minister why this course has been adopted. It is well known that the Minister of Marine is not a militia man whereas the present Minister of Militia is and all future ministers of militia should be militia men.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend commenced his remarks by charging a rake-off. He has now come down to patronage, and I hope he will end by being thoroughly ashamed of himself. Can he not suppose that sometimes men may be actuated by honest motives?

Mr. J. D. REID. Certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well, then why does he not commence now and assume that we are actuated by honest motives in this? My hon. friend could take charge of this department, the minister who has charge could do it just as well and there is no reason why there should be any suspicion in my hon. friend's mind as to why the department should be allotted to one man or the other. But my hon. friend has it in his mind that there are to be rake-offs and charges of corruption. I invite him to the closest possible scrutiny, I invite him to be on the lookout, and to watch and be prepared to criticise every item of expenditure. I have only to say that the suspicions to which he has given expression are altogether wrong. There has been no middleman at all in this transaction, the transaction was simply on a report of Admiral Kingsmill, our adviser. The transaction has been completed, the money has not been voted and when it is, it will go direct from one government to the other, and that will be the last of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask a few questions for the information of the public. Rumours of different kinds are floating around the House and some of them have appeared in the press. For instance, how long was Admiral Kingsmill in the employ of the British admiralty? Why did he leave? How long was he in this