

Q. Again, along the line that I asked a few minutes ago, a very large number of the people in our hospitals are immigrants. Would you say that it was not the duty of the Dominion Government to take care of the aliens that they bring to this country, and dump on our municipal hospitals? I have had complaints both from the Montreal hospitals and my own city of Winnipeg along that line.—A. Well, I have nothing to add to my statement of the alien on that subject.

Q. But, in the same way as in the control of aliens, the Dominion Government might be held responsible for the care of those aliens?—A. I think there is a difference between having legislative jurisdiction over a matter and being held responsible for what the legislature does. The question of what the legislature will do about it is purely a matter of policy outside my field.

Q. But they at least would have jurisdiction to act?—A. We always try to claim as much jurisdiction as we can, and we like to work the word "alien" for all it is worth.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. We often use a phrase in our legislation, "a work for the general advantage of Canada." You could not do that in this case, could you?—A. No, there are no works involved.

Q. The word "work" does not necessarily mean building?—A. It means something more than a mere aggregation of individuals. The word "work" means some building or other.

Q. Not necessarily. It might be an undertaking, might it not?—A. I could not support that. It means something physical.

Miss MACPHAIL: Do we work? We don't, do we?

*By Mr. Heaps:*

Q. If I understand the statements here this morning correctly, I would interpret your remarks to mean that the Federal Government has not authority to impose Dominion-wide legislation, or has not the authority to impose compulsory unemployment insurance, or sickness insurance?—A. Yes, that is correct.

Q. Well, on the other hand, if the Dominion Government created permissive legislation along the line of the Old Age Pension Act, it would be quite in order for the Federal Government to make appropriations in the same way as it did under the Federal Old Age scheme?—A. In my opinion, yes. But, there is a possibility that legislation of that kind might be questioned at some time upon the ground that Parliament should not use its moneys for purposes which are primarily provincial. In view of certain provisions of the B.N.A. Act, which deal with the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and the manner in which it is to be dealt with—

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. But they give grants to provinces?—A. We have done it right along, and it has never been questioned.

*By Mr. Heaps:*

Q. If it were not so, all those grants would be illegal. The grants for Old Age Pensions would be illegal, and all the grants which the Federal Government to-day is making to all our provinces would be ultra vires?—A. Yes.

Q. And the whole of our relationship would be entirely shattered, so to speak, between the provinces and the Federal Government?—A. I did not say that. My opinion is the other way, but—

Mr. McMILLAN: You never know until it is tested.

[Mr. W. S. Edwards.]