

under are expended for technical education as provided by this Act.

I think it would be sufficient to say that every province receiving a grant shall furnish the minister with such evidence as he may require to show that the grants paid are expended for the purposes agreed upon.

Mr. CALDER: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: All the words after "for" can be struck out and the words "the purpose agreed upon" inserted after the word "expended."

Mr. CALDER: The section as amended will read:

As provided for in the agreement with such province. Each province receiving a grant shall furnish such evidence as may be required to show that the grants paid hereunder are used for technical education as provided for in the agreement with such province.

Mr. BUREAU: The agreement under this Act?

Mr. CALDER: It is not one agreement. There may be a slightly different agreement with each province.

Mr. BUREAU: That covers it.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 7—Appointment of staff:

Mr. BUREAU: Has the minister any idea of the staff that will be required to carry out the provisions of this Act?

Mr. CALDER: I have not gone into that matter myself. This Bill was prepared by the Labour Department and the information required in its framing has been gathered by them. I would think that not more than one, or possibly two men would be sufficient for the purpose because the Labour Department, in carrying out this Act, will be merely an advisory and not an administrative department. I think it will be a distinct advantage to have one or two technical experts who can advise the minister as to the agreements and who can help the various provinces in unifying and harmonising the work. I think that one first-class man would probably be sufficient.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like to ask the minister if it would be possible for him to reconsider a certain feature of this Bill. If he would do so it would eliminate all the expense that is possible under section 7. If the words in subsection (c) of section 2, "approved by agreement between the min-

ister and the Government of any province as being necessary or desirable" were eliminated, the provinces that have the machinery already in operation would be able to administer the fund covered by this Act without any expense to the country at all. I think that we might depend upon the educational departments of the various provinces to handle the money to the best possible advantage and to the satisfaction of the department in the country. I am in entire accord with the principle of the Bill in providing a fund for technical education. Immediately the armistice was signed the United States Government passed an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for this special purpose. They realised the necessity of getting busy at once with the education of their mechanics, artisans and the members of various trades in that country up to the very highest stage possible. We are travelling along the same line. We cannot get busy too soon with this class of work and we cannot give too much aid to it. I would suggest, in order that as much money as possible may be conserved, and as we have confidence in the educational departments of the various provinces, that the administration of this fund be left entirely with the provinces.

Mr. CALDER: The honourable gentleman was apparently not in his place when this question was raised by the honourable member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). If these moneys are to be granted without some measure or supervision by the federal authorities I think I am quite safe in saying that the Government is prepared to drop or withdraw it. The Government has come to the conclusion, after very full and serious consideration, that if grants such as these are to be given to the provinces there must be some supervision and control. We had a very full discussion of the point the last time the Bill was before the House, and the clause has been before the Committee this evening also, when the honourable gentleman (Mr. Pedlow), apparently was not in his place. The clause was carried. I do not think we can raise the question again at this time. I had no knowledge that \$100,000,000 had been voted by the Congress of the United States for these purposes. There is a proposition before Congress whereby a sum of between \$90,000,000 and \$100,000,000, covering a period of years, shall be used, if the proposition is carried, for a campaign of Americanizing the foreign-born in the United States. The only similar law I know of is the Smith-Hughes law, passed