

share of the moneys which the people of that province have contributed to the federal treasury, and not as a matter of favour or generosity on the part of the federal government. Then my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) is reported in 'Hansard' to have entirely approved of putting this amendment in the Bill. As reported at page 5384 of 'Hansard,' the Minister of Agriculture made this statement, following some words which I had uttered:

Mr. BURRELL. There is absolutely no desire on the part of the government to divide the money in any way except what is absolutely fair and equitable. I stated in introducing the Bill that the money would be granted according to the population of the various provinces, and I think there would be no objection to bringing down the supplementary estimates divided as they would be according to the population of the various provinces.

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

Mr. BURRELL. I do not see why.

Therefore we have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of this Bill, that he sees no reason why this provision should not be incorporated in the measure. I submit that it is reasonable, that it is exceedingly desirable, and that it should be done. Therefore I beg to present this amendment for the consideration of the House.

Mr. BORDEN. Some of the arguments which my hon. friend has just addressed to the House would be arguments in favour of a motion for the six months hoist, rather than the amendment which he has presented this morning. The hon. gentleman, however, did not feel inclined to adopt that course. Instead he proposed an amendment requiring that moneys that have not yet been voted should be distributed in a particular way. I can only say to my hon. friend, as I said in the discussion which took place on this measure in committee, that the Bill does not authorize the government to grant one dollar to any province in Canada, but merely provides a means by which the federal government can secure the co-operation of the different provinces for the just and effective expenditure of certain moneys that may be voted by parliament during this session or in any subsequent session. The distribution of those moneys will be effected, not by this proposed Bill, but by the Appropriation Act. Therefore every purpose that my hon. friend has urged this morning will be effected by the estimates when they are brought down and passed by this House, if they should be passed, and when they are incorporated in the Appropriation Bill. My hon. friend seems to find fault with the proposal that

Mr. PUGSLEY.

the government of Canada should appropriate a certain sum of money for the assistance of agriculture in the different provinces of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg my right hon. friend's pardon. He certainly could not have heard me, perhaps I was speaking in too low a tone of voice. I have never found fault with the proposition.

Mr. BORDEN. If my hon. friend does not find fault with the proposition I do not quite understand the object of his motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want these expenditures to be based on a proper principle.

Mr. BORDEN. I have explained over and over again in the debate on this Bill and in the debate on the Highway Bill, that when the appropriations are brought down they will be based upon the same principle as that on which the subsidies to the provinces are based, and that that appropriation to the different provinces will be carried into the Appropriation Act, and will become the law of this land just as fully and just as effectively as if the amendment which my hon. friend now proposes should be passed by this House and the Bill should be amended accordingly. For what purpose therefore does my hon. friend suggest that the division of that appropriation Bill in respect to provinces should be included, not only in the Appropriation Act but in this Bill as well. I see no good purpose which can be served by the adoption of my hon. friend's motion, and I therefore ask that the House shall not accede to it.

Mr. OLIVER. Aside from the point raised by the hon. member for St. John, the Bill, as it strikes me, is a very serious departure from well accepted precedent in the distribution of the moneys of the country. This Bill proposes to give the government authority to distribute money voted by parliament. If this principle applies to the vote for a hundred dollar wharf in Nova Scotia, surely it is just as right that an amount of money that is available for the assistance of agriculture in any province should also be subject to the vote of parliament. The government says: 'We are going to make it subject to the vote of parliament,' but the country has to take the word of the government on that point instead of the mandate of parliament; and the responsibility upon each member of parliament to see that the authority of parliament over the moneys of this country is maintained is just as binding upon that member as the responsibilities of members of the government are binding upon them. Therefore for my part I wish to insist most strongly that the proposition contained in the Bill is not such as should find favour with a representative body such