

work carried forward at such seasons would be done more cheaply and more thoroughly than under conditions of abnormal activity and would render unnecessary the spending of vast sums on maintaining willing workmen in idleness....

And yet, in the face of this pronouncement by the *Globe*, hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to induce this Government to lessen its expenditure and to reduce work in this country to a minimum, thereby throwing tens of thousands of Canadians out of employment. The reverend gentleman who wrote that article described the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite as "peanut politics," and I comment that description to them. No more unpatriotic move could be made by any man or body of men in Canada than to endeavour to induce municipalities or governments to curtail expenditure in these trying times. I believe it to be the duty of every great city, every municipality, and every government in Canada, to spend every dollar they honestly can on legitimate works, for the purpose of providing labour for our people. We cannot afford to lower the standard of our workmen, by making them subjects for charity.

My friend from St. John would allow the people of Canada to dole out charity to the mechanics and working men; but the *Globe*, the Liberal organ, holds that it is peanut politics to preach a doctrine of that kind. The *Globe* says further:

There are many organizations engaged in the study of social conditions—Conservation Commissions, Unemployment Commissions, Social Service Commissions. They could do nothing more calculated to fill up the valleys of depression than to secure that public employment shall be at the minimum in Canada when private employment is at the maximum, and that the stress of hard times shall be lessened by the construction of public works during seasons of depression.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to have it so arranged that the public works shall be at the minimum, that the public expenditures of Canada shall be cut in two. One hon. gentleman went so far as to say that one large item of \$5,000,000 in connection with the Hudson bay should be cut out altogether. In view of these statements it is hard for me to know which party to believe, the Liberal party in this House or the Liberal leaders out of the House. It reminds me of the story of the gentleman who was visiting a neighbour's house and was charged by a vicious looking dog which went at him as if it was going to eat him. The host came out and said, "Oh, don't be afraid of him, can't you see he is wagging his

tail?" The visitor replied, "Yes, but I do not know which end to believe." It is the same to-night, I do not know which end to believe, whether I should believe the junior member for Halifax and the hon. member for St. John, and the other members who have advised the Government to cut down expenditures and leave the workmen to the charity of the people of Canada, or those who advocate a wise continuance of public works.

I think that a party with such an unsavory reputation as far as its pre-election pledges are concerned ought to hesitate before making any such statement as that which was uttered by the hon. junior member for Halifax. I have criticised the attitude taken by the hon. junior member for Halifax regarding the cutting down of the Estimates for public works; and I wish to quote his words now. Speaking of the Estimates of the Public Works Department, the hon. junior member for Halifax said:

Can the Minister of Public Works himself submit to the House any fair defence for his request to Parliament to vote practically \$20,000,000 for public works expenditure in 1914-15? I do submit, and in fairness, I think, having in view the circumstances prevailing throughout Canada this year, and throughout the world for that matter, that instead of the Government's asking for an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for public works, they might have asked for \$10,000,000 or less, and, if need be, they might have wiped out altogether expenditures for public works for the next fiscal year. I do not believe that the people of any province of Canada would have objected to the most drastic measures on the part of the Minister of Public Works during the present year and during the next fiscal year in connection with public works expenditure. Many of these projected works were without justification, the necessity for others have at least temporarily passed away by reason of the declining business of the country. Expenditures for these purposes should have been reduced to the minimum this year and next year.

The hon. member for St. John, taking the lead from the hon. junior member for Halifax, followed along the same lines. He had been advising my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to cut down the expenditure on public works. The minister asked him across the floor of the House if he would be willing to have the Estimates cut down for his own county, and his reply was:

I would not be worthy of my position as a member of this House if I did not answer "Yes" to that question. I would not be worthy of the confidence of the people of my constituency if I were so cowardly that I would not dare to stand up in my place and give an answer to