

was in our opinion wrong, and we decided to put in the model clause.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—issue of securities:

Mr. LANCASTER: There is a slight amendment at the end of the second line which now reads:

The directors, if previously authorized as prescribed by section 136 of the Railway Act, may borrow money.

And so on.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

## SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 190, for the relief of George Sentis Deslandes.—Mr. Warnock.

Bill No. 191, for the relief of Daisy Madeleine Peterson.—Mr. Nesbitt.

## THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 170, respecting certain patents of the Standard Paint Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. Sharpe (Ontario).

Bill No. 168, for the relief of Pierre Zenon St. Aubin.—Mr. Schaffner.

## NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed consideration in Committee of Bill No. 21, to authorize measures for increasing the effective Naval Forces of the Empire.—Mr. Borden. (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

On section 2:

Mr. LAW: Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is gratifying to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to find that hon. gentlemen on the other side are able to open their mouths and to say something in connection with this great question which has been before the House and the people for several months past. It is gratifying to us because we feel that if the gag has been loosened to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House it certainly will be loosened to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) before the House rose at six o'clock. I felt sorry for that hon. gentleman at one time during his speech because, when he undertook to tell a joke, he was unfortunately the only one who laughed at it. He found a great deal of fault with this side of the House for its lack of enthusiasm. I am sure that if there has been a graveyard without any new burials during the last three months it has been found on the other side of the House. Very seldom has any hon. gentleman opposite opened his mouth on this question to defend the policy that the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) brought in before the House in December

of last year. I am sure that if any enthusiasm has been shown at all, it certainly has been shown on this side of the House. On a memorable Saturday night some little time ago there was enthusiasm enough on this side of the House to suit hon. gentlemen opposite and if there is a repetition of it to-night they will probably get all the enthusiasm they desire.

The hon. gentleman went on further to say that he really believed that there were some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who did not believe in any contribution at all. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman from Brantford that, if he could see into the innermost depths of the minds of some hon. members sitting behind him, he would perhaps find some who were not in favour of a contribution and not in favour of doing anything for the Mother Country. We are prepared to do something, to do just as much as hon. gentlemen opposite although perhaps we may not talk so much about it. We are prepared to show our patriotism and to do something for the Mother Country.

I was amused to hear my hon. friend from Brantford refer also to the visit of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Toronto the other night. It seems to have stirred some hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of the Conservative newspapers, to think that the right hon. gentleman could go to Toronto and, after filling the largest place in Canada, hold a meeting from which thousands were turned away. It shows that the Liberals in the good old province of Ontario are not all dead and that when they have an opportunity to do so they will speak with no uncertain sound. Even the members of the Tory party in Toronto were so eager to get to this great Liberal meeting that not knowing there would be any room for them, they had to forge tickets enough to enable them to attend. I hope the lessons that they received there will do them good and that they will be able to change their policy in a great many respects.

Then, the hon. member for Brantford found fault with my hon. friend from St. John city (Mr. Pugsley). I have no brief to defend my hon. friend from St. John. Hon. gentlemen opposite have found out during this session that that hon. gentleman is fully capable of taking care of himself. If the hon. member for St. John was looking after the interests of that port I want to ask why the hon. member for Brantford should find fault with him. It is strange that the hon. member for Brantford, a manufacturer in the province of Ontario, as I am informed, does not seem to have any great love for the Maritime provinces. He, and others like him, exhibited that feeling at the election on September 21, 1911, when they turned down the reciprocity agreement which would have given the Maritime provinces larger

Mr. LANCASTER.