

of \$20,000 annually which is paid to the Government of each province. The remainder of the annual grant is to go to the Government as a vote as the subsidy would go. I think a fair view of the Bill is that this is practically an additional subsidy to the various provinces but particularly ear-marked for agricultural purposes. And if I can gather the true meaning of the minister from the language he has used in this House, he and his commissioners and the officers whom he has in his department or whom he proposes to appoint have concluded that the best way to expend the money to be of assistance to agriculture in Canada would be to expend it in the direction of education on agricultural lines. I do not know whether anyone else has considered the warrant of this Parliament for expending money for educational work. It opens up rather a broad question. We see in the provisions of this Bill one that at all events points to the expenditure of money of the Parliament of Canada to assist education—the work of veterinary colleges. That is clearly and simply educational work, and education, by the terms of the British North America Act is distinctly provincial work, and work over which this Parliament has no control. I do not object to that expenditure; I favour it: At the same time, if it be made in this case it should be made in other cases, and if my hon. friend the Minister of Labour were in his place to-night, I would like to point out to him what I have pointed out in this House once or twice before, that, while we have been expending in the past large sums of money through this Parliament directing the establishment of works of educational value—for instance, our experimental farms—we have never spent anything to assist education along industrial lines. We are at this time awaiting a report upon the subject of technical education. I merely point out that if we now grant sums of money for the educational work in agriculture, it will form a precedent in the future for granting sums of money for technical education when we come to consider that question when the report is brought down, as I trust it will be in the course of a short time. I do not think there is framed, as to the expenditure of them is any great danger, as this Bill is framed, as to the expenditure of the money. I believe that the matter will come up year by year for consideration, but, at the same time, I do not like the principle upon which the vote is to be given. It seems that the present Government has in many cases, adopted this principle of statutory grants; we have it in the Highways Bill; we have it in the present Bill; we have it in the Naval Bill, and I submit that this

Mr. GUTHRIE.

is subversive of the parliamentary principles of the past. It is not a step in advance; it is a retrogressive step, and unless some very good reason is given why the grants should be made en bloc, as proposed under this Bill, I think it much better to make them in the old-fashioned way, by annual expenditure, rather than by statutory grant of a lump sum, the expending of which shall not be made within the current year, but shall be extended over a very great number of years. I think the minister would do well to consider the objection raised by my hon. friend from Edmonton in his amendment; the acceptance of his suggestion would not impair the effect of the Bill, and would comply with the well-established parliamentary practice of this House.

Mr. OLIVER: If section 4, which provides for the distribution of the money, were the only part of the Bill providing for the distribution of the money, were the only part of the Bill providing for such distribution, then section 3 would, it appears to me, be entirely satisfactory; that is to say, Parliament would then be deciding that a certain amount of money should be apportioned for certain specific purposes during a certain period. But section 5 changes the purport of section 4. While section 4 makes what appears to be a specific distribution of the money, section 5 brings in the responsibility of the Governor in Council in regard to that distribution. It is elementary that, if the Governor in Council is to have discretion in the distribution of that money or in the uses to which the money is to be put, the Governor in Council is responsible to Parliament, and Parliament should take the opportunity of discharging its responsibility to the people, to vote that money. Strike out section 5, and section 3 is good; leave section 5 in and section 3 is a departure from parliamentary principles, and does not permit of that opportunity for such fair discussion of the yearly projects of the department as would be beneficial. I shall not to-day ask my hon. friend for his plan of campaign for the coming year; he is only at the beginning of his policy, and he is entitled to every opportunity to lay down his plans and get them, to some degree, into operation. But having had the opportunity for a year to lay down a policy, when he comes again to Parliament, he has a certain measure of responsibility for what he has done, and Parliament is entitled to have something to say about that which he is going to do. The exercise of that right by Parliament would be secured by the amendment which I have suggested. As to the suggestion of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), that such a course would hamper administration be-