

tem of Government which is in vogue in Canada and has been in vogue, as I have already stated to my right hon. friend, since 1837. My right hon. friend says why go back into English history? He knows, and so does every hon. gentleman in the House know who knows anything of the former history of upper and lower Canada, that what created the rebellion in upper and lower Canada was the very fact that the expenditure of public money was in the hands of the Governor in Council, and not controlled by the responsible representatives of the people—and that is what this Government is doing at the present time. What is the clause of the Bill?

The said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of the Governor in Council in the construction and equipment, &c.

And the amendment which I have proposed to this committee is that:

The said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of Parliament.

I have already instanced the case of the expenditure of money for the construction of the new Welland ship canal. The expenditure of that money is under the control of Parliament. My right hon. friend says: Why, every year we give to individual ministers of the Crown large sums of money for which they are responsible. We certainly do. The Ministers of Public Works, Marine and Fisheries, and Railways and Canals, and the Postmaster General, all have enormous sums of money under their control. They are responsible though to Parliament for the expenditure of that money from year to year, and we vote the money, we examine their accounts each year in the Public Accounts Committee, scrutinizing them very carefully, and they are obliged to be as particular as reasonable men can be in their expenditure. I am glad to know that usually the expenditures of public money in this country by individual ministers of the Crown have been reasonably satisfactory. There have been some few instances in which men, for all men are human, have made mistakes and the Public Accounts Committee has perhaps too severely criticised in some such cases. But you cannot get away from this fact, that the Parliament of Canada has never at any time voted to the Governor in Council any large sum of money to be expended over a series of years without accounting each year to Parliament and to the Public Accounts Committee. That is the question which is at issue here, and that is the reason why I have suggested this amendment. I intend to raise the same question in the way of an amendment to the other clauses of the Act, emphasizing the fact that we on this side of the House are not opposed to the construction of battleships, not opposed to aiding the British navy,

not opposed to aiding in the naval defence of the Empire, but that we are opposed to handing this money over to the Governor in Council, to spend at their own sweet will by way of contribution or in any other way, and that we believe those ships when built should be directly under the control of the Parliament of Canada. That is our position; that is the position we have occupied throughout this whole discussion; that is the position which we will continue to take until this Bill passes out of our hands.

Mr. BORDEN: If my hon. friend is of opinion that the voting of \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 by this Parliament subject to the control of an individual minister who may call for tenders on public works without consultation with his colleagues, if he is of the opinion that that system offers greater safeguards to the public of this country than a system in which the money must be dealt with under the direction of the Governor in Council, I shall have to leave him to that opinion; I am afraid I cannot convince him. He holds up to us the Naval Service Act of 1910 as his ideal of absolute protection of the public interest. Let us look at section 7. The hon. gentleman seems to be of the opinion that section 7 reads in this way:

Parliament shall have the control and management of all naval affairs, including the purchase, maintenance and repair of the ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, stores, munitions, and habiliments of war intended for the use of the Naval Service.

I am afraid I will shock my hon. friend when I inform him that he voted for a clause which does not read in that way at all, but which reads in this way:

The minister shall have the control and management of all naval affairs, including the purchase, maintenance and repair of the ordnance, ammunition, arms, armouries, stores, munitions, and habiliments of war intended for the use of the Naval Service.

As I understand my hon. friend that is a perfect safeguard to the public interest, but if the clause had provided that the Governor in Council shall have control of all naval affairs, including the purchase, maintenance and repair of the ordnance, munitions, arms, armouries, stores, munitions and habiliments of war intended for the use of the naval service the public interest would be absolutely unprotected. That is his argument, that if you leave it as it is, that the minister shall have charge and control of all those matters, the public interest is protected. I am not able to appreciate an argument of that kind, and I think that my hon. friend, on reflection, will find that he is not able to appreciate such an argument. In the present case the Governor in Council is given a greater control, that is the Govern-