

cause the vote would have to be divided into many details, that argument, in my opinion, does not hold. As a matter of fact, many of the departments to-day have lump sums voted. When the minister comes to Parliament with his estimates, he is prepared to inform the House as to what his intentions are in regard to the distribution of that money, but the information he gives to Parliament as to this distribution is merely a declaration of his intentions; it really does not hamper him in the distribution of the money if circumstances require that his statement to Parliament should be varied. There is, therefore, no reason for objecting to the amendment on that ground. I do not wish to press the matter seriously when the minister does not seem to be inclined to view it favourably, but I say again that the amendment would bring the Bill in accordance with ordinary parliamentary practice and regular constitutional usage, and I believe it would tend to the better working of the Bill. I notice there is a provision in section 6 for the voting of money by Parliament from year to year for the carrying out of the purposes of this Bill. There is a vast difference between voting of money that will merely achieve certain objects, and voting money subject to arrangements that have been made with the provinces, which arrangements, of course, are of far-reaching importance, and, for the part of the arrangement for which the Government is responsible, Parliament is responsible; the members of Parliament are responsible to their constituents, and should have an opportunity to discharge that responsibility satisfactorily.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.): The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) made a statement to the effect that he doubted the power of this Parliament to pass legislation regarding education. I desire to direct the attention of the hon. member to section 95 of the British North America Act, which provides that this Parliament and the local legislatures shall have concurrent powers of legislation respecting agriculture and immigration. If this Parliament and the local legislatures have concurrent powers regarding agriculture and immigration, why should not the power which they have regarding agriculture include education? What is the object of this Bill? The Bill provides that, instead of voting money for the purpose of establishing a farm on which cattle shall be raised, schools, for instance, may be established in which lectures shall be given and demonstrations held. In the province from which I come, out of the moneys which were granted under the Agricultural Aid Act of last year, a course of instruction, attended by over five hundred young men of the province, was given in the city

of Charlottetown. Lectures were delivered and demonstrations made as to the killing of cattle, the manner of putting up meats, and general matters of agricultural interest. The young men who attended these lectures and demonstrations received great benefit from them. This proposed legislation is, I presume, in furtherance of the policy which was adopted last year. The Government, instead of making agricultural aid a matter of haphazard action, have decided that they will put it upon a permanent basis. Each province of the Dominion has an agricultural staff, and this staff, in my opinion, should work in conjunction with the staffs provided by the Dominion Government in each province. We have a very good staff in Prince Edward Island; and there is a good staff in Ontario. Why, then, should not these staffs work together? The money will be granted to the governments of the different provinces; the people of each of these provinces are in a better position to know its requirements than men who come from other provinces to deliver lectures, for instance. When this money is put into the hands of those governments under an agreement, as this Bill provides, for its expenditure, I think the money is perfectly safeguarded, and that the Dominion Government is taking a course which is in the best interests of all the people. The agreement must provide the purposes for which the money is granted, and I think it is perfectly right that this Parliament should state that the money so granted should be used only for agricultural purposes. It would not be proper that the money should be allowed to go into the general revenue of the province; it should be ear-marked, as this Bill provides; and, this being the case, the Government of Canada having control of the money under the agreement entered into with the provincial government, I do not see that any harm will result or any wrong be done to the people of Canada by passing the Bill as it is. What is the object of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) on Friday last? It is that although this sum of \$10,000,000 shall be expended over a period of ten years, the Minister of Agriculture shall come to this Parliament each year and ask that the amount of the appropriation to be made for that year shall be designated by this Parliament. Is that reasonable? Is it an improvement? Would this Parliament change the amount which this Bill indicates shall be given to each province? What object would there be in asking this Parliament to revote that money every year for ten years? I fail to see any reasonable argument in the contention raised by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with respect to this Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. McLean) appre-