

if it had been voted upon. It came up for consideration on Friday night when there is an understanding between the whips that there shall not be a vote and in accordance with that understanding a vote was not called for. But the effect was just the same as if a counted vote had been taken on the amendment. The Opposition put in their formal protest in favour of the principle contained in the amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Just to clear up this matter, let me say that I have the amendment before me. It was on the 18th of April that the discussion on the Agricultural Bill took place. The amendment moved by my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) was as follows:

That section 3 be amended by inserting after the word 'fourteen,' in line 22 thereof, the following words:—

'Upon appropriations in that behalf from year to year made by Parliament'; and by adding to the end of said section 3 the following words, namely: 'provided the same shall be voted yearly as aforesaid.'

After some discussion the vote was taken and the amendment was declared lost.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Because you were afraid to vote.

Mr. BURRELL: As the Agricultural Bill is brought into the discussion, perhaps I may be permitted to say a word in reference to it. It is a little difficult to follow all the opinions that hon. gentlemen entertained in regard to the principle involved in the Agricultural Bill because these opinions, as expressed by various portions of the Opposition, were diametrically opposed. But I would like to call attention, in reference to what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said, to the fact that in discussing the Highways' Bill the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), referring to the Agricultural Bill said, and I may be pardoned in this case for using his exact words:

Why does he—

Referring to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane).

—not do as was done in the case of the Bill for aid to agriculture? That Bill was under discussion here a day or two ago. There was no opposition to it on this side of the House. The Bill was allowed to proceed to its second reading without a word of dissension from this side, because its object was stated in the proper way. If my hon. friend followed the example of the Minister of Agriculture, and would do so through and through, there would not be a word of criticism of his measure. The Bill for aid to agriculture provides that a sum of so many million dollars shall be voted, to be distributed over a certain number of years.

Mr. OLIVER.

And so on.

That explains the position of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. OLIVER: The Highways' Bill provides for a vote by Parliament each year; the Agricultural Bill did not so provide and our amendment was that it should so provide.

Mr. BURRELL: I do not dispute that, but I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman's leader said that if the Bill of the Minister of Railways had followed the Bill of the Minister of Agriculture through and through, there would not be a word of criticism.

Mr. GRAHAM: In my opinion the Highways Bill was an improvement on the Agricultural Bill, in that it did ask for a vote annually. As to clause 7 of the Naval Service Act which says that certain things shall be placed under the minister, it is necessary to have such a provision in any Bill, because the working out of the policy has to be placed in some department, and the intention of that clause was merely to put these details in charge of the minister, but it did not give that minister power to spend one farthing until he told the House what he wanted the money for and got the vote. My right hon. friend is hardly correct when he says that the giving of a large amount to be expended by one minister is not as good a safeguard as if the expenditure were under the control of the Governor in Council—

Mr. BORDEN: I said giving the control of the expenditure to the Governor in Council was at least an equal safeguard and probably a greater safeguard than giving it to one minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: For example, the Minister of Railways is voted \$25,000,000 by Parliament, but he cannot let a single contract until the Governor in Council agrees to it.

Mr. BORDEN: He can decide on the tenders and advertise for tenders.

Mr. GRAHAM: He may advertise for tenders, but he cannot let a contract unless the Governor in Council approves of the contract by Order in Council. Then again, under the Transcontinental Railway Act, the original of every contract has to be submitted to Council before it can be let by the commissioners, although the commissioners have very wide powers. But the vital principle which my hon. friend from Welland contended for was, that even though a minister must have the approval of the Governor in Council before he spends any money, he has to come to this House every year before he is allowed to submit a contract even to his colleagues