

best to redeem its pledges to relieve unemployment by cooperating with the municipalities and with the various provincial governments all over Canada. In this respect millions have been spent and the credit of Canada has not been shaken. Owing to the devotion of the Solicitor General (Mr. Dupré) more than \$5,000,000 have been put at the disposal of the district of Quebec for the relief of unemployment. I may not be endowed with the great vision with which hon. members opposite have been favoured, but I fail to see in the legislation voted last July all the evils which characterize a usurpation of power. This legislation is of a remedial character. Its object is to carry out a scheme of unemployment relief in cooperation with the municipalities and the provinces. Relief moneys have not been spent in the fanciful way depicted by hon. members of the opposition; many people had to be consulted. According to the regulations adopted by the Department of Labour, all requests for public works had first to be submitted to the municipal authorities, who discussed the measures and adopted the resolutions which afterwards were sent to the provincial authorities. The provincial authorities on the other hand made an investigation through their inspectors and sent a list of questions to the municipal councils with respect to the number of unemployed and the nature of the public works necessary to relieve unemployment. In short, Mr. Speaker, all relief measures have been thoroughly discussed and submitted to the people—first to the municipal council, secondly to the provincial authorities, and when the provincial authorities had come to an agreement with the municipal authorities, the proposals were submitted to the federal government. In no case has the federal government ever refused to comply with the requests of the provincial governments.

Now that I have stated how the relief scheme is operated, can it be said that the government is acting arbitrarily, despotically and extravagantly in the measures which it has taken to relieve unemployment? As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has never refused to comply with the requests of the provincial authorities, which requests sometimes, especially in Quebec, were submitted with a view to prejudice the Conservative party. The other day the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) denounced in the most emphatic way the partisanship which was displayed by the Liberal party in the spending of relief money in his county. I may say that in the county of Dorchester, which I have the honour to

represent, the same situation existed. For instance, though a large number of municipalities and the county council of my county recommended to the provincial government the expenditure of \$75,000 for the construction of a road, that recommendation was not approved because the provincial authorities did not want the credit to go to a certain extent to the Conservative member for Dorchester. But, while the provincial government thought it extravagant to build a good road for the use of the farmers, which would have provided work for about one thousand unemployed, that same government authorized the expenditure of \$75,000 for the construction of a zoological garden near the city of Quebec. I am not opposed to the construction of this garden, which will prove an asset to the province and to the county of Quebec-Montmorency in which it is situated, but why should the provincial government refuse to spend \$75,000 for a road which would give bread to the poor farmers while they consent to the diversion of \$75,000 of relief money to provide a shelter for animals? I give that example, Mr. Speaker, not in a spirit of criticism but only to show that the federal authorities have never put obstacles in the way of provincial authorities. They have accepted even such schemes as the one to which I have referred, which may be considered rather a doubtful way to relieve unemployment.

Coming back to the constitutional issue raised by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), I agree that legislation by order in council in ordinary circumstances ought to be resorted to only in cases of necessity, but the Prime Minister stated in this house that he assumed this power reluctantly and only because we were facing a national calamity, and he and his colleagues knew of no other way to deal with the situation. In the past the great Liberal party has resorted to that method. We all remember the election of December, 1921, when the issue of conscription was raised in Quebec. The ministers were sworn in some time in January, 1922, and early in February the hon. member for Quebec East, who was Minister of Marine, by order in council transferred the entire administration of fisheries in the province of Quebec to the government of the province without receiving the authority of parliament. Does my hon. friend think that, when one morning the Canadian government learned with great surprise that England was off the gold standard, the government should have waited fifteen days to call a special session of parliament to pass the necessary legislation? That would