

Whenever the Governor-in-Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the two preceding sections, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

Constitutional Practice.

Now, this is the practice of the British parliament when war is declared. The King may declare war and has the right to do so under the British constitution. Should this be done, parliament is immediately called to furnish the necessary supplies. Why should we depart in this case from a well established constitutional practice? If the parliament of Great Britain sees fit by controlling supplies to restrain a passionate King, or an impulsive government, from rushing heedlessly into war, why should not the parliament of Canada exercise a similar control over the government?

4. The Borden Bill proposes to take a vote of thirty-five millions in one lump sum for the construction of the proposed battleships, while the practice of Parliament is to vote from year to year as much money as may be required for one year's service.

What is the constitutional law? The constitutional law is that parliament cannot take any appropriation for more than one year. The law as to appropriation is the same as the law as to mutiny. Soldiers are enlisted for one year, and that Act has to be renewed from time to time, to keep them in the service. Parliament can give an appropriation for one year. I ask my hon. friend to inquire if he can find a precedent in the history of England in which parliament gave three years' supplies on any subject to the government of the day. I will put it to him in another form. I may be wrong, but I do not think I am. Can he find a precedent in the history of Canada where parliament placed three years' supply on any subject, or for any purpose, at the disposal of the government in advance? There is no necessity for it. Let me revert to our action in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the contract for the construction of that railway, parliament was asked to appropriate twenty-five millions (25,000,000) acres of land and twenty-five millions (\$25,000,000) in money. Did the Minister of Railways ask parliament to vote the whole appropriation at one time? Certainly not, but following the parliamentary rule he took from year to year as much money as was necessary for the service of that year in the annual estimates. It has been the same with the National Transcontinental Railway and the Welland Canal, and the same with any public work which hon. gentlemen are now engaged in building. The constitutional principle of placing money at the disposal of the government many years in advance is wrong.

Now let me briefly enquire what has been done under the Laurier Act of 1910, which Mr. Borden has so blindly overlooked. The royal assent was given to that Act on the 4th of May 1910. In the meantime a vote of Three million (\$3,000,000.) dollars was taken for the purchase of training ships, and for their maintenance during the fiscal year 1910-11. By that vote two ships were purchased and put into commission and about 500 seamen enrolled for training. Tenders were called for additional ships, but as they