

hended what I said, or what I intended to say, when I was discussing the question of education as applied to the Dominion and the different provinces under the British North America Act. I quite realize that this Parliament has concurrent jurisdiction with the provincial assemblies in regard to agriculture and that we have exclusive jurisdiction in regard to matters of trade and commerce. My object in stating what I did state was to impress on the Minister of Labour and of the Government that if they granted money for agricultural education or aid to agricultural education they would be fully justified in granting it for technical education as soon as the report of the Technical Education Commission is before Parliament. I welcome the expenditure, I do not oppose it, but when I argued two or three years ago that the Government should expend money on technical education or industrial training, it was contended that that was a matter affecting general education with which this House had nothing to do. I argued that this House had to do with it as it was a matter having to do with trade and commerce.

Mr. HAZEN: The House evidently took that view.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Eventually, but after some difficulty, in the matter, and some of the provinces took a different view at first, but finally came to the same conclusion. I do not take exception to the passing of the grant; I approve of it and I hope it will form a precedent so that when the question of technical education in the provinces comes before us the Minister of Labour will be well supported in proposing such a grant.

Mr. McKENZIE: This principle of voting the amount every year is not a new idea to the minister. I do not quite understand why the hon. member for Queens, Prince Edward Island, and the minister himself should think that there was anything wrong about this doctrine or principle of asking that Parliament should vote the amount from year to year. The Bill which the minister brought down last year and which had practically the same title, its title being 'An Act for the Aid and Encouragement of Agriculture,' contains the principle which we are advocating. The expenditure of the money proposed this year is simply a departmental expenditure.

Mr. BURRELL: It is hardly purely departmental, inasmuch as all these agreements are entered into subject to the sanction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: We contend that the business of the country should be administered by Orders in Council just as little as possible, that the expenditure of public moneys should be granted in the

open and that ministers should get from Parliament every year approval of the expenditures they proposed to make. The people of the country feel that they have a certain safeguard or bulwark in that all expenditures come under the review of the Auditor General, but where you have a provision of this kind appropriating or pre-empting this money for ten years by statute, it does not come under the review of the Auditor General until the expiration of the ten years, so that this safeguard of which I speak is removed. The second clause of the Act of last year read:

The Governor in Council may, in any year and upon such terms and subject to such considerations as are prescribed by Order in Council, grant to any province for the encouragement of agriculture a subsidy not exceeding such sum as may in such year be voted by Parliament for that purpose.

That is the authority that he took for himself last year. The Government, I presume, was then just as wise as it is to-day, and I would like the minister to explain what was the matter with the power which he took last year. He repealed the Act of last year, and when he asks us to surrender the power which Parliament had under the old Act of controlling these expenditures and voting the money from year to year, he should give the House to understand why he is doing it. Did he find himself hampered by section 2 of the Act last year? Did he not have a sufficiently free hand in dealing with the provinces? Why is he departing from this well-established principle of parliamentary government and control over these expenditures?

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I desire to congratulate the minister upon the progressive legislation brought down in this Bill. To me, coming from the splendid province of Ontario, it is really pleasing that the opposition to the Bill has not been very forcible, nor has it apparently been organized. I would say, in agreement with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), that I appreciate very much, as he does, the idea that, all things being capable of execution under this Bill, there being no constitutional provision in the way, the same principle should be extended on some future occasion to benefit the labouring classes of this country along the lines of technical education. I feel satisfied, from the progressive nature of the measure and from the general attitude of the present Government, that the signs point to progress along every line that will tend to the betterment of the people at large; so I hope that some day in the early future that point may be granted. In regard to what was said by the hon. member for North Cape Breton

Mr. GUTHRIE.