

as this parliament is, and should not find favour having due regard to the well established rules and practice under which the public moneys of the country are disbursed and distributed by the government, subject always to the will of parliament.

There is another point, in mentioning of which I may be out of order, Mr. Speaker, but which I will not dwell upon, and it is this: In distribution of this money the various provinces are made subject to what the Bill euphemistically calls 'co-operation,' but which I understand to mean interference by the government of the Dominion with the administration of the provinces. On what ground does this parliament come to the conclusion that the government of each of the individual provinces of the Dominion is not competent to manage its own affairs? Why should the government be authorized by parliament to interfere with the government and administration of any of the provinces of Canada? If those governments are not competent to transact their own business in the interest of their people, then the people of those provinces have the privilege of dealing with them just as the people of Canada have the privilege of dealing with us.

I will not add anything to what my hon. friend from St. John has said as to the propriety of respecting the rights of the various provinces. It is not necessary to add anything to emphasize the objection which I urge to this Bill, that it subjects parliament to the doctrine that it is right and proper for the government of the Dominion to interfere with the management of provincial affairs, an interference that is absolutely opposed to the very foundation principle of the constitution of this country, and is derogatory in my estimation, to the dignity of the provincial parliaments and of the provinces that they represent.

Mr. BURRELL. I do not wish to take up time, but I would like to make one or two remarks in reply to my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley), and my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). It seems extraordinary that when this government is desirous, and shows its desire, to help agriculture throughout the country, to devise some way in which it can be done to meet the wishes of the various parts of the country, there should be so much criticism. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) states that this is somewhat of an interference with the provinces, and asks why each province is not capable and competent to manage its own expenditures on agriculture. It is precisely because we want to work upon such lines in the future as will not make for interference but will allow the provincial governments and the federal governments to act freely in their respective spheres. I stated in introducing

this Bill that we proposed this as an interim measure until we should have an opportunity to examine the whole subject, with the idea of working without the duplication of efforts which now goes on. I could give many instances in which we are doing work that they might better do and they are doing work that we might better do, of overlapping and of conflict of jurisdiction. Until we find out by thorough examination what the provinces want to do and should do and what we want to do and should do, this measure has been brought down; because it was felt that this parliament should at least give some grant now to enable the provinces to spend more on agriculture. But my hon. friends opposite seem to be frightened that this money is going to be put to some base purpose. There is absolutely no desire on the part of the government or myself as Minister of Agriculture to devote it to anything but the promotion of the best interests of agriculture in the various provinces.

My hon. friend from St. John called my attention, and, if he will allow me, I will say called attention in his usual ingenious way, to something that was said in the last discussion of this Bill. Of course, he is a master of English, but I think he is a little twisted here. Here is the quotation from 'Hansard':

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, why should that not be provided in the Bill?

Mr. BURRELL. I do not see why.

I did not add the word 'not.' I do not, remember exactly the form of words I used, but clearly what is intended there is, 'I do not see why it should be provided in the Bill.' My hon. friend has overstepped himself in his ingenuity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) is the ingenious one.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. gentleman is remarkably clever in his use of English but he has gone too far in this case. I do not recall my exact words, but what I said was that I do not see why it should be included in the Bill. I am perfectly willing that the amounts should be divided as outlined when the supplementary vote is brought down. I have only to repeat, what my hon. friends opposite still do not seem to understand, this is not devised as a permanent policy; I specifically stated in asking leave to introduce the Bill that we do not necessarily endorse the principle of a cash subsidy to the province as a permanent policy for agriculture, but that we intended to help in some stronger way than in the past and that when we found the right lines on which to work we would consider the subject more comprehensively and intelligently than we could now. I should be loath to think that hon. gentlemen would throw any difficulty in the way