

The hon. member who succeeded in that contest was introduced this evening. In furtherance of what I said to-day may I point out that speaking in that campaign the Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret) stated that Montreal needed a Canadian National station. He asserted that the hole in Dorchester street would be closed up. On the following evening the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) said, "If you do not get your station Mr. Houde will be responsible."

Let us look at the other side of it—and I ask the Prime Minister to think of this matter carefully. The construction of the station would involve an expenditure of several millions of dollars. That is a matter for the government to consider. It is for them to determine whether or not the finances of the country are such that the taxpayers can afford to assume this added responsibility. That is not a matter with which I shall deal at this time. However I am dealing with the fact that the promise was made by the Secretary of State and, on the following evening, was supported by the Minister of Public Works. Can we afford to have promises of that kind made in a by-election, or any other election? What is more, the Secretary of State was very careful to say that he did not make that promise on his own. He was too careful a man to do that! He is reported to have said that if they wanted the hole filled up their duty would be a very simple one. He hoped that they would discharge that duty in the proper manner—and, apparently, from what we have seen to-night, that was done.

Let us go a step farther. Coupled with this was the question of unemployment relief. In the Montreal Gazette of January 15, 1938, we find a report of a meeting held in the city of Montreal on the previous evening. In that report I find this:

So long as there are unemployed there will be direct relief for men, their wives and children.

So said the Secretary of State.

We will do our part, and if the municipal powers, and provincial powers should become fatigued, be tranquil. While there is a single unemployed, the federal government will see to their sustenance. It is not an independent who will do that. It is not a man isolated from all parties who can do anything. He may make eloquent speeches, even enact farces, but I am authorized to repeat to you that as long as there are unemployed in Montreal, even if we are alone, the federal government engages itself on honour to give sustenance to him, his wife, and children.

That is the position.

The same may be said with respect to the building of a subway under the Lachine canal. Here we have three things: We have the Canadian National station; we have the subway under the Lachine canal and we have

the promise that if the province fails or if the municipalities fail, the federal government will see to it that sustenance is given to the men, their wives and families. That, he says, he is giving, not on his own. He has said, "I give that to you," and makes the statement that "the federal government engages itself on honour to give sustenance to the unemployed, his wife and children."

May I say to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), an hon. member who comes from a city which is finding it very difficult to deal with the situation, that his troubles are solved. Everything is over now. He need not worry any more. The province of Manitoba has said it cannot carry the burden, and the city of Winnipeg says it cannot do it. But here is the promise of the government of Canada to do it, with respect to Montreal, and it cannot avoid the same responsibility with respect to Winnipeg or Calgary or Vancouver.

I am asking whether the government of Canada is prepared to say that it will carry out such an undertaking with respect to Montreal, and not carry it out with respect to Vancouver or Winnipeg or Calgary or Toronto or any of the other great cities in Canada? We now have no occasion for any further worries. They are past. We have that unity and determination which will ensure that there will be no further difficulty with respect to the poor and the unemployed, their wives or their children, in any of the cities of Canada. When I read that I rejoiced, because I knew that although the province of Alberta cannot help Calgary any further and although the citizens cannot provide any further moneys, the great Dominion of Canada, through its Secretary of State, speaking on behalf of the government, has bound itself in honour to provide for unemployed men, their wives and children. I rejoiced that the city of Calgary was now safe for the rest of the hard winter.

That would be true, also, with respect to Winnipeg. Winnipeg need worry no longer. They need not be concerned when Mr. Bracken, premier of Manitoba, says to them, "We cannot give you any further assistance." Under great difficulty, as is known, they did give assistance to Winnipeg for the month of January. That month ends to-day. Now some one else will provide. Now we have intervention by the Secretary of State when, in a by-election, he says, "The federal government engages itself on honour to give sustenance" to the unemployed, their wives and children. He points out that those people will receive sustenance from the federal authority.

Of course that means the expenditure of considerable money—but that is not a matter