

sessions money should be expended in the interests of agriculture, which did not occur to anyone during the previous session? Would it not be in the general interest to give a certain amount of latitude in the working out of the expenditure under this measure?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is often inconvenient to be compelled to go into details of expenditure, but it is almost the foundation of our system of government. In the administration of the Intercolonial railway it would often be convenient to deal with matters without a vote of Parliament but unless in extraordinary circumstances the minister is not allowed to do so. For example, if a sum of money were voted for a certain level crossing at a given point on the Intercolonial, the Minister of Railways could not take that money and build a level crossing somewhere else. It is inconvenient, but it is right when you come to think of it; Parliament might not agree to his spending the money in the other place. I am not arguing strongly against this money being a statutory vote. Where the money is given to the provinces and where the provincial authorities may be carrying out details of their own which they have not yet communicated to the minister, it would be difficult for him to place before Parliament a complete statement every year. However, if clause 7 remains in the Bill under which he can expend the money instead of the province, then details should be given to the House about that expenditure which is made directly by this Government.

Mr. BURRELL: The hon. gentleman understands as well as I do the difficulty of working out such a scheme in advance. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), complained the other night that we were not giving this money outright to the provinces, that we were still keeping control of it. That complaint has come to me several times. It has been said that we should give this money to the provinces to do what they like with it. On the other hand, the hon. member for Edmonton thinks we should keep control. We have tried in this Bill to take a position whereby we trust the provinces will work out these things and yet whereby we can exercise some reasonable supervision. We admit that, in a sense, this Bill is a new departure, but I do not think there will be any difficulty in amending it if it is found desirable. At the same time, I do not see strong enough reasons, in spite of what the hon. gentleman says, to alter the clause. There should be no difficulty in getting a full discussion.

Mr. NESBITT: The hon. minister has pointed out what I objected to. If the money were given absolutely to the prov-

inces, it would be simply a grant to the provinces. But the hon. gentleman reserves the right to say how the money shall be spent. For that reason I ask him how he proposes to spend it. He answers that he cannot tell. If he has laid out plans—and I will warrant he has a plan in his mind—as to how this money shall be spent by the provinces, I do not see why he cannot tell Parliament what form this agricultural education is to take. The hon. gentleman declines to do this, and that is why I object to the Bill in its present form. If the hon. gentleman is going to retain control, I do not see why he should not tell Parliament how this money is to be expended; and if he is not going to retain control, I do not see why the provinces could not be entrusted with the money. If these moneys were to be voted every year, which was the proposition of my hon. friend from Edmonton, the minister would have to tell Parliament at each recurring vote what he proposes to do with the money, and we could judge whether it is to be properly expended or not. I have no objection to the grants of money each year for this, my only objection on that point is that these grants will be very small when divided over nine provinces. But the hon. minister refuses absolutely to say what form this expenditure is to take.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Is it the intention to establish demonstration sheep farms in Nova Scotia? If so, where?

Mr. BURRELL: I could not answer that. We have had some discussion with the Nova Scotia government, and there will be a very thorough discussion of the whole matter, and anything that is wise and best for the interests of agriculture in that province will be arranged between the Government of the Dominion and the government of the province.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just a word in regard to the contention of my hon. friend from North Oxford that the money would be better expended if handed over to the provinces than if it were controlled by the Department of Agriculture and this Government. I think if my hon. friend from North Oxford will read section 4 of the Bill he will find that the provinces are entrusted absolutely with the expenditure of by far the largest proportion of the money, subject to certain conditions with regard to the payment of the money to be agreed upon between the Dominion and the provinces. It is evidently the intention of the Act to have the whole apportioned to the provinces for expenditure, but the Dominion seeks to control the expenditure in so far as the sum of \$20,000 a year is concerned which is to be particularly appropriated for the purpose of assisting agricultural colleges, and the further sum