

friend from Jacques Cartier comes, and together with the new light of the Conservative party, Mr. Bourassa, in the province of Quebec, they are playing the game of the leader of the opposition down there. That is his policy. Does he want a plebiscite? Not a bit of it. Any one who reads the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) will see there is no connection at all between the words he uttered and the demand in his resolution for a plebiscite; there is no logical connection between the two at all. Plebiscite indeed? Why, the game that the member for Jacques Cartier is playing is the old game the Conservative party has been playing ever since Canada has been ruled by the Liberal party led by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They have been telling the people of Quebec that he was too English for the French, and in the English provinces they have been saying: Surely you are not going to have a Frenchman rule over you? I have read the amendment of the leader of the opposition with the greatest possible care. It is drawn with a great deal of astuteness. In our province of Nova Scotia the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has always been recognized as a very shrewd lawyer, and he will pardon me for saying that that resolution was drafted as some counsel would draft the defence in a bad case, in which counsel did not know exactly how to answer the complaint. The hon. gentleman always had the reputation of being an astute lawyer, and when the opposition wanted to declare their policy they committed to his hands the task of quibbling, and drawing up this defence for their bad case. Why, what does the hon. gentleman say? He says that what worries his soul is section 17 and section 18 of the Naval Bill, which sections say: That the Governor in Council may place the navy on active service when it appears there is an emergency, and that in case of emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service and so on. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) regards that as very dangerous. And it is because of these clauses in the Bill that the hon. gentleman rushes off and says: I won't have anything to do with the Canadian navy at all, give them a contribution. Now, one would think that the government had undertaken something very revolutionary and something that was never heard of before.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, oh, that smacks of independence. Well, what is the condition of affairs in that regard? Of course, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) regards those sections as most terrible—but from another standpoint. They tie us

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD.

he says, to the empire in an irrevocable way—taxation without representation and all this kind of thing. The King's prerogative, he told us, will enable His Majesty to declare war at any time without the consent of parliament and Canada would be tied hand and foot. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition was also worried. But what need is there for any anxiety on his part? Look at Todd and see what is done when a question of war comes up. On page 351 of his work I find it laid down:

The previous consent of parliament, either to the commencement of a war or the conclusion of a peace, is not formally required by the constitution. The necessity of obtaining adequate supplies for the prosecution of a contest with any foreign power, and the control possessed by parliament over the army and navy by means of the annual Mutiny Acts, coupled with the existence of ministerial responsibility, constitute a sufficiently powerful check against the improper use of the prerogative. Nevertheless if the hostilities about to be entered into are likely to involve serious consequences, it would be the duty of the ministers before engaging therein to summon parliament to communicate to it the reason for resorting to arms and to ask for its advice and co-operation in carrying on the war.

That is what has to be done in England in the case of a war of any serious character, and in this Bill provision is made that before the Canadian forces may engage in war, the Canadian parliament must be called together just as the English parliament is in the old country. Yet my hon. friend's soul is worried and he is shocked tremendously. Is this anything new? Why it has been in the Militia Act for years. How can a navy run without money and how can the navy get money without the government comes to parliament and asks for it? Is it a new departure taken only by Canada? My hon. friend should know that Australia has had it embodied in its Defence Act since 1903. Let me read the Defence Act of Australia of 1903 regarding the disposition of Australian forces in case of war, and there is no country which the hon. gentleman has held up to us as so signal an example of everything loyal, patriotic and splendid. Section 53 of the Australian Defence Act is as follows:

Section 53. In time of war the Governor General may subject to the provisions of this Act, place the defence force or any part thereof under the orders of the commander of any portion of the King's regular forces or the King's regular naval force as the case may be.

Section 54. The Governor General may in time of war—for the defence and protection of the Commonwealth and of the several states thereof—place the naval forces or any part thereof on board any ship of the King's navy on the Australian station, and during the time they are so placed they shall be under the command of the officer commanding the ship upon which they are placed and be subject to