

scious of their duty, we would probably have been able to spend \$10,000,000 of it this year, as far as I can estimate. But, at the present time, a considerably less amount than that sum might be expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If that is so why not ask for a vote of \$10,000,000 and if the \$10,000,000 is not expended, whatever is left unexpended lapses and the amount would have to be revoted. Why depart in this instance from what has been the ordinary custom? Why treat it differently from the appropriation for the Transcontinental railway or the appropriations that the Minister of Public Works asks, amounting to \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000? Why not do exactly as they do in England with respect to the army and navy estimates where an amount is asked for and a statement is made as to what it is proposed to expend during the current year?

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell), for the purpose of giving an assurance to the agricultural interests of this country, asked this House to make a vote of \$10,000,000 to be extended over a period of ten years. The House accepted the principle. My hon. friend desired to have that done in order that the expenditure of the money might be assured for a particular, definite purpose in the public interest. So, on the present occasion, in view of circumstances which have been disclosed to this House, and which I shall not weary the House by repeating, the Government thought that two things were desirable; in the first place, that there should be an assurance given to the people of this Empire, and to all the nations of the world that, under conditions as they exist at present, Canada proposed to give such aid to the naval defence of the Empire as would assure the safety of that Empire for some years to come and as would convince the nations of the world that the dominions were one with the Mother Country for the purpose of securing her safety. Then, in the second place, it was thought desirable that, in view of any proposal of that kind, the Parliament of Canada should be afforded the opportunity, which I think it ought to have embraced, of voting that sum definitely and at once, in order that the construction of three battleships of the latest type might be secured for the purpose in view. That was the object of the Government in making that proposal, not to vote \$10,000,000, but to say at once to the Empire and to the world: This is the aid which Canada proposes to bring in view of certain urgent conditions which confront the Empire at the present time and are likely to confront it for the next three or four years. If the object and purpose of the Minister

of Agriculture, which received the approval of the House, were desirable, it seems to me that the object and purpose which I have just indicated should have commended themselves to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. It was for that reason, and with that end in view, that we made these proposals to Parliament.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does my right hon. friend think for a moment that there is much similarity between the principle involved in the grant of money contained in the Agricultural Bill and the Naval Bill? I cannot see it. The Agricultural Bill proposes to expend the sum of \$10,000,000 in ten years and the Bill itself appropriates the money. It says that \$20,000 shall be spent upon veterinary colleges, that the provinces shall be given \$20,000 in round numbers to spend as they see fit and that the rest shall be apportioned between the provinces according to the last decennial census. That is hardly a parallel case when one considers the proposal to spend \$35,000,000 as contained in the Naval Bill. It seems almost too absurd to reply to that portion of my hon. friend's remarks when he says this Bill is practically for the saving of the British Empire and that for that reason we are putting the \$35,000,000 in at the present time. Could he not accomplish the safety of the British Empire without placing one dollar in the present Bill, by merely stating in the Bill that it was the purpose of the Government to build three of the largest battleships that money could supply and science devise, and then let my right hon. friend come down and ask that the money be voted? Would not that save the Empire just as much as placing \$35,000,000 in this Bill?

Mr. PUGSLEY: There would not be so much fireworks.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Certainly, there would not be so much fireworks, there would not be so much in the London newspapers and there would not be so much talk about activity in the British shipyards. But he would follow the uniform practice of this House if he would only come to Parliament and ask for the money instead of seeking to subvert that principle by apportioning \$35,000,000 to the care of the Governor in Council.

Mr. OLIVER: Might I correct my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in regard to the position of the House on the Agricultural Bill? When the Agricultural Bill was in the committee, an amendment was moved to require the money to be voted annually by Parliament. On the third reading of the Bill the same amendment was moved. It was not voted on, but it was declared 'lost on division,' the effect being the same as