

is no longer governed by Parliament but by Cabinet; it is a revival of the Star Chamber. The Opposition is completely ignored. And yet, Heaven knows, an Opposition is necessary in Canada at the present time. The immemorial right of any member of the House to express his views as often as he sees fit on any phase of a question in committee goes by the board. We are compelled, being a new country, to make great expenditure every year in public works; that expenditure must be scrutinized by the representatives of the people, and it must be scrutinized freely and lengthily. Yet supply can be rushed through, railroaded, when a minister so notifies the House. The old rule of exposure of grievances before supply is curtailed to two days in the week. That resolution, when one reads it coolly, constitutes a violation of the fundamental principles of British parliamentary government. It is more than a resolution; it is a revolution. One has to return to the days of Runnymede, when the barons of England—and they were Norman barons—exactd from King John the famous article 12, of Magna Charta, that no taxation should be levied on the people of England without the free consent of the common council of the realm. Sir, the Government is doing away, partially at least, with that old time-honoured rule of British parliamentary government, that no taxation for any public expenditure shall be levied on British subjects without the free consent of the commons. And, after all, why this radical change—aye, why this coercion? Because of the jingo stampede organized by a coterie in England, by a few busy empire saviours, in Ottawa, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Winnipeg—which is not the public opinion of the country. Because the Government having no mandate for such a policy, will not seek that mandate at the hands of the people. Because the Tory-Nationalist alliance must be maintained at all costs in order to remain in office. Sir, the novel proposal involved in these constitutional changes, the question of representation in the Imperial Council, is above all one that should come before the people. We were all united in 1909 on a Canadian navy, built, manned, maintained by Canada, ready to hoist the flag, and, subject to the control of Parliament, to defend the Motherland against the King's enemies. You have gone back on that resolution, and we must ask the people to approve or disapprove of your treason. Besides, we desire to keep the control of public expenditure within our own hands. The Churchill letters have also created a new situation; they have complicated our present relations with Great Britain. We have just tasted of Downing Street rule; the people must know more

about what that means. A policy of centralization is heralded and advocated by this Government as against the policy of local autonomy—a cherished policy up to the present time. You cannot trifle with such important principles, and you cannot impose such radical changes on the people's representatives without consulting your peers, the people. We on this side represent half the people of Canada; let us test public opinion and see whether it will be responsive to the new proposals of the Government. Do not silence the House of Commons; the Liberal party is too proud of its traditions to stand gag rule. Sir, I would commend to the Government the advice given by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) in the parting shot fired by him at his former allies. In one of to-day's papers I find the following statement made by Mr. Monk:

I expressed such an opinion before a special commission of the House that such a modification should be made at a period of calm, when everyone could study fully the question and not in the course of a crisis as exists now.

I still believe that a referendum is the only logical solution of the navy crisis—the only one that would give a real value from an Imperial point of view to our contribution if such contribution is voted.

I would have voted against both the Borden and Laurier naval proposals and I am sorry to see that a closure law is proposed at a time which prevents a serious study of it and appears like a way of forcing the adoption of a policy which I disapprove.

I sincerely believe that those who oppose the naval policy of the Government cannot accept a proposal which under the circumstances is but a way to assure the adoption of a policy which they condemn.

All that we, the opponents of the Borden proposal and the friends of a Canadian navy, require, and ask for, is a fair chance and fair play. Let us go before the people, and we will fight one of the most glorious battles of Liberalism. We stand for free speech, and in favour of Canadian autonomy. The prayer of the Grecian combatant, when enveloped in unnatural clouds and darkness, is at present the appropriate political supplication of the Liberal party to the powers that be:

Dispel this cloud, the light of heaven  
restore,

Give me to see—and Ajax asks no more!

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester, N.B.): It is not my intention to discuss the technicalities of the amendment under consideration. As you know, I have never been an obstructionist in this House. You, Sir, have been here during all the years I have