

Webster,
Wallace,
Carrick,
Cochrane,
Jameson,

Lovell,
Power,
Martin (Montreal),
Graham,
Molloy,

Ruling confirmed.

House again in committee on the Bill.
(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): Now that we have disposed of this point of order, and decided that this clause is before the committee, I desire to make a few observations on it. For the information of hon. members, I shall read the clause, because we have been discussing other matters so long that we have overlooked what was contained in it. It says:

Such ships, when constructed and equipped, shall be placed by the Governor in Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire.

I desire, first of all, to congratulate this Government on one thing in regard to this clause—

Mr. CARVELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEVENS: I am pleased to know that my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., seconds my congratulations to the Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman has found his tongue.

Mr. STEVENS: I think it would become the hon. member for Carleton, while an hon. member has the floor, to maintain silence; I do not think the House is very much edified by any remarks that might fall from his lips. I was remarking that I desired to congratulate the Government upon the fact that this is an improvement over the Naval Service Act which was placed on the statute book in 1910. It goes further, and is an evidence of the willingness of this country to take upon itself the responsibility of sharing in the defence of the Empire. This is a measure which the people of Canada have been demanding for six years. The majority of the people of Canada, I believe, have been willing to contribute to assist in maintaining the supremacy of the Empire and to share in the expense which is incurred thereby. During the debate on the second reading of this Bill, and last year in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I took the position that Canada should assume its share of the cost of maintaining the naval supremacy of the Empire just in proportion as Canada's trade compares with the trade of the Empire. I have, however, some slight criticism to make to this clause that is before us, and I have no hesitancy in making it. I am confident that the people of my province will back me up in any criticism I make on

Mr. GAUVREAU.

this matter. The sentiment of that province is well known to the House, and is well known to members on the other side of the House who have taken considerable delight from time to time in twitting members from British Columbia upon the lack of patriotism and the lack of loyalty to their own province, so I take this occasion of making one or two suggestions to the Government in regard to this matter. In the first place, I do not think this goes far enough. The clause clearly states that these ships may be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire. I desire to say that so far as I am concerned these ships should be given absolutely and unequivocally to the British authorities for the naval defence of the Empire. I do not say that such a policy should be perpetuated, but I do say that in so far as this section of the Bill is concerned, and in so far as the present occasion is concerned, as we are giving an evidence to the country and to the world at large of our feelings in this matter, it should be an out-and-out gift. However, the Government has seen fit to put it in the form of the clause now before us.

Mr. CARVELL: The Government themselves do not know what it is.

Mr. STEVENS: I think the hon. member for Carleton realizes that in spite of the thirty-odd speeches made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), the twelve made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the eleven made by himself and so on down through the rank and file of the Opposition, the Government does know its own mind and intends putting that mind into effect.

Mr. CARVELL: With the gag.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. member says something about the 'gag.' Let me answer him in that regard. Up to the time of the second reading there were fifty-seven speeches on the Bill and a speech on the Government side for every one on the Opposition side. I ask this House and this country, if speeches covering over fourteen hundred columns of 'Hansard' is not a sufficient debate on such a measure as this.

Mr. OLIVER: May I ask what my hon. friend is talking about now? He did not give us his speech then.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. member is answering a question.

Mr. STEVENS: Not only that, but in spite of the fact that the term obstruction was protested against by hon. members opposite, yet, when it suited their tactics to say so the right hon. leader of the Opposition gets up and boldly says that the obstruction was justified. And only the other day in Toronto, as he said here on the floor of the House, he regards himself