

everybody knows that. Let me take the statute of 1919: Arts and Agriculture—Authorized by Statute, then comes a list of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and all the provinces, and at the bottom under the heading of "summary" this: To be voted, \$3,648,000; Authorized by statute, \$1,100,000. I am going to follow that up to 1920, where the same thing appeared. To be voted, \$3,903,000; Authorized by statute, \$1,100,000—absolutely as I said. I am going to go further and take 1921: To be voted, \$4,502,139.50; Authorized by statute, \$1,100,000. There it is every year, and I am going to point out why, for this is the act passed by my right hon. friend's government.

I will not read the preamble—yes I will, because it adds point:

Whereas it is desirable that encouragement be given to agriculture in all the provinces of Canada, and whereas great and permanent benefit will result through education, instruction and demonstration carried on along lines well devised and of a continuous nature;

Note that, "of a continuous nature":

Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Agricultural instruction Act.

2. In this act, and in any regulations made hereunder, "Minister" means the Minister of Agriculture; "province" or "provinces" shall not extend to or include the Northwest territories or the Yukon territory.

Then comes section 3, and this is the milk in the coconut:

3. For the purpose of aiding and advancing the farming industry by instruction in agriculture, and for the purposes authorized by this act, the following sums, aggregating ten million dollars, shall be appropriated and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada during each fiscal year for the period of ten years beginning with the year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, namely:

During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and fourteen, the sum of seven hundred thousand dollars;

During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and fifteen, the sum of eight hundred thousand dollars;

During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and sixteen, the sum of nine hundred thousand dollars;

During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and seventeen, the sum of one million dollars;

During the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, the sum of one million one hundred thousand dollars; and the like sum of one million one hundred thousand dollars during each of the succeeding fiscal years until the expiration of the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty three; provided that any portion of any of the above sums which may remain unearned or unpaid at the expiration of any of the said fiscal years previous to the last shall be carried forward and remain available according to its apportionment for the purposes of this act during any one or more of the succeeding years.

That is the statute, and the estimates were based on that statute, and were not placed in the estimates during these years for the purposes of discussion, and they were not discussed, because it was not necessary. They are there designated "authorized by statute." The other item is to be voted, and of course everything can be discussed in supply, because there is an item in the estimates for the application of the act, and under that vote everything can be discussed every year, just as it can be under the Railway Acts that I am now bringing in.

I come now to the year 1923, where the same thing occurs again. To be voted, \$4,984,500; authorized by statute, \$1,100,000. That amount was not voted, but was authorized by statute.

Now I am coming to the estimate that my right hon. friend read, and I am going to refer to the House for their judgment. He read the estimate 1923-1924:

"Grant to the provinces of Canada for the purpose of assisting and encouraging agricultural instruction, grants to be made on a proportional basis." True, but the act had run out, and the money had to be voted or the farmers would not have got the money that year, it not being payable by statute any longer, and the government not having given the farmers notice voted another sum one year after the expiration of the statute. I want to point this out because although my veracity may not appear to be much to my right hon. friend, it means a great deal to me. In the estimates of 1923-1924 my right hon. friend left this little item out in the reading. Before Item 51, which I have just read, appears a star, and this is what comes after the star: "Grant to the provinces of Canada for the purposes of assisting and encouraging agricultural instruction, grants to be made on proportionate basis." Then follows the note to which the star refers, as follows: "Note: The amount shown for 1922-23 was authorized by statute."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I think I can be just as frank with the House as my hon. friend. The statement that he has made, all to the effect that I had denied that these votes were authorized by statute, is beside the point. I stated distinctly they were authorized by statute. I stated distinctly, the programme contemplated by statute and provided by statute, running in each case for those years. I stated that the item appearing in the estimates was voted each year, and I did that on the authority of the only estimate I had before me, which read just as the minister has said.