

in council, and he must give this House the details of what he is going to do with the money. Suppose the Minister of Public Works should rise to the occasion and go on with the Georgian Bay canal, he would have to submit what he intended to do to this House, and he would have to get the approval of this House for the work by the vote of a sum of money, but even then he would have to get the approval of his colleagues before he let a contract. The difference is not as between the minister and the Governor in Council; the difference is that under our practice every expenditure should come to this House before it is made, and not after it is made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Prime Minister has told us that the reason for this unprecedented departure of asking a vote of \$35,000,000 at once, is because the Government wanted, by naming the \$35,000,000, to let the Empire and the world know that Canada was going to take this step to save the Empire. If the right hon. gentleman had said that it was done in order to have the proper dramatic effect and to set off a little fireworks, I should understand the argument. But, that is not what the British Government does. The practice of the British Government is to lay down a programme for the building of vessels which would take in the ordinary course from two to three years to build, and the Government does not ask the British Parliament to vote the total amount of the cost of these vessels at once; it only asks for the amount which it is expected will be expended during the coming year. I take it that the British Government is just as anxious to let the world know what they intend to do with regard to saving the Empire as the Canadian Government can be. The British Parliament is jealous of the expenditure of public moneys, and with regard to no department is it more jealous than with regard to the army and navy estimates, over which it retains the right of discussion every year, when a vote is asked. In the estimates before this Parliament now, there is a vote for a certain amount of money in the harbour of St. John. A contract has been entered into with the firm of Norton Griffiths and Company, Limited, involving an expenditure of several million dollars. That work cannot be finished in one year, but the contractors have no fear but that this Government and this Parliament will keep faith with them, and it has not been considered necessary in respect to that contract to vote in any one year the total amount to be expended over several years. In the Agricultural Bill the Government made a departure which in my opinion is not justifiable. The only ground upon which the Minister of Agriculture could

attempt to justify it was that he was proposing to enter into an arrangement with the provincial governments extending over a period of years, and it was necessary that those governments should know what they could rely upon for the coming ten years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that that is the only precedent?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The only precedent. I cannot at present recall any other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can tell the hon. gentleman of another passed by his own Government.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the year 1899, the Government of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition passed an appropriation to the Ottawa Improvement Commission of \$60,000 a year for ten years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a very different proposition. That involved an arrangement with the city of Ottawa under which this city undertook to provide fire protection for the departmental buildings and to provide a water service. It was a settlement which was agreed upon to extend over a period of years. Perhaps my hon. friend will be able to tell me whether Parliament voted the money annually in respect of that amount.

Mr. BORDEN: No, they increased it to \$100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That was for a period of ten years.

Mr. BORDEN: Twenty years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is an exceptional case. Surely my right hon. friend cannot cite that to justify the voting now of the enormous sum of \$35,000,000 and the placing of this large sum of money for the period of three or four or five years entirely outside the control of Parliament.

Mr. BORDEN: I shall give my hon. friend another.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My right hon. friend may give small and unimportant instances of that kind. My hon. friend from South Wellington says that the money for the Ottawa Improvement Commission is voted annually.

Mr. BORDEN: It is authorized by Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a money vote.

Mr. BORDEN: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It is put in the estimates just in the same way as the judges' salaries are.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not voted in bulk.