

away from the influence of the people of England, who probably were a little inflamed at the time and from the influence of the naval and military officers, and after all the discussion that has gone on in this House, and considering that these hon. gentlemen are men of ability who want to do right in the government of the country, I am very much surprised that they should still insist on this absolutely unnecessary vote of \$35,000,000. I think they realize that a policy of continuous contribution will be unpopular in this country, and that the people will not stand for it. One or two gentlemen opposite, at an early stage in this debate, said that contribution was what we ought to have. My right hon. friend the leader of the Government, however, has told us distinctly and emphatically that it is not the intention of the Government to continue this policy. If that is the case, they must realize that it will be necessary to build a Canadian navy. Then, why do they want to give away \$35,000,000 of the people's money, when it is not required in England? My right hon. friend the leader of the Government has tried to explain what he meant by an emergency. We all know, the country at large knows, the people of Great Britain and Europe know, that there is no emergency at this time. Therefore, the excuse for the sending of these \$35,000,000 passes away. Then, why vote it? I know it would take a good deal of courage on the part of my right hon. friend and his Government to stand up now and own up to the people of Canada that they were mistaken, but I believe it is a courage that would pay them in the end. They could easily show that conditions have changed so far as England and Europe are concerned. The man who wins out in politics or business is the man who is not afraid, the man who does what he thinks is absolutely right in the interests of the people he represents, if he happens to be a director of a corporation; and our friends of the Government are nothing more than the directors of the corporation of Canada at this time. They must acknowledge that the sending of this \$35,000,000 as a contribution is absolutely unnecessary. Why then, should they not boldly go on with the naval programme that must be gone on with eventually? It is proposed with this money to build three dreadnoughts. A dreadnought, as we know, is a line of battleship. The navy that Canada will build, in my judgment, will not require dreadnoughts nearly so much as it will require very swift cruisers well armoured. Why? Because that for which we shall need a navy is to protect our shores and our trade routes. Everybody, I believe will acknowledge, no matter whether he knows much or little about a navy, that it is not so necessary for us to have dreadnoughts for the line of bat-

tle as to have swift cruisers that could strike and get away. In this way we could protect our swift merchantmen and our own shores. For that reason I think it is a mistake to build dreadnoughts at the beginning of our Canadian navy. Now I have another objection to bring forward, and I shall try to keep myself in order under the rules. Apparently I was mistaken as to the form of the present discussion. I thought that this afternoon the whole Bill would be up for consideration, all the clauses having been postponed yesterday and the day before. If we are to grant this money, we should grant it just as we vote other money that is required. It is all right for my hon. friend the leader of the Government to say that it amounts to the same thing; it does not amount to the same thing. The estimates that we have in our desks are given to us year by year to show exactly what the Government are going to do with our money. If a minister spends money on something else than that for which it is voted, he is liable to be censured by Parliament. He has no right to spend it on anything else except on that for which it is voted, and he has to make a report to Parliament as to that expenditure through the Auditor General. But the tendency of this Government is to make expenditure by Order in Council. We had the other evening a Bill similar to this in this respect. The leader of the Government said the other evening that it passed unanimously. He was corrected on that point and shown that as a matter of fact it had not so passed; an amendment was moved and I personally opposed it being passed unanimously. And I opposed then as I oppose now the principle of expenditure of money by Order in Council. Judging from the way things are going, we shall soon be governed by Order in Council. Last year there was a great tendency to govern the country by commission; this year everything is by Order in Council. The principle is absolutely and radically wrong. I am sorry that the Government have not seen fit to withdraw the proposition for this contribution. My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) has shown very clearly the benefits that might be derived from continuing the naval policy of the late Government. The leader of the Government does not propose, at least he has not proposed so far, to continue the Naval Act as passed under the late Government.

Another reason why I find fault with this Bill, and it comes next, so far as I am concerned, to my objection to the expenditure in itself—is that the Government have not seen fit to show us what their naval programme is to be. I do not think it is fair to this side of the House for the Government to ask us to vote on a half issue. They only disclose half of their intentions. The only indication the leader of the Government has given us as to his view concern-