

activity, there is no opportunity for the federal government to associate with municipal governments in opening up a permanent channel through which destitution can be alleviated and employment developed. Because that, I take it, is to be one of the plans of permanent employment relief to be developed. If the dominion government cannot enter into arrangements with the municipal governments, how can that be worked out?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I answer my hon. friend at once by directing his attention to what has been done by the Dominion government in connection with old age pensions. In this one particular, not to mention others, the federal government has granted large sums for an all important social service carried on in the provinces and which immediately benefits the municipalities, but has had to do so having regard to restrictions as to procedure imposed upon it. Where the federal government has made grants in aid in connection with old age pensions the grants have been to the provinces. It is only by that method, subject to such supervision as the dominion and provincial governments working together may have arranged, that dominion funds have been distributed to the municipalities.

Mr. BROOKS: The minister gave some figures in connection with the different provinces, and I notice that the figure for New Brunswick is out of proportion with the figures for the other maritime provinces. Is it not a fact that the camp at Fredericton, New Brunswick, serves the maritime provinces, and that a great many included in the New Brunswick figure should be credited to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island?

Mr. ROGERS: The figures for New Brunswick, running across the columns, are as follows: On February 29 the figure stood at 1,115; on March 15 it was 1,057; on March 31, 931, and on April 4, 801. In New Brunswick, as in the other provinces, there was during that period a steady decrease in the populations of relief camps.

Mr. BROOKS: The minister did not get my point. There is a camp at Fredericton, New Brunswick, which serves the maritime provinces, and I should like to know if in that camp there were not a number of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island single men. If so, were those men kept separate in the figures?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

Mr. BROOKS: The figure for New Brunswick seems greater than it should be.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sorry I did not understand the question when it was first asked. These are the figures from the relief camps in all the provinces, and they do not take account of provincial origin of camp populations.

Mr. BROOKS: Then the figure would include the maritime provinces?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. BENNETT: I should like to have a minute, so that the minister may make clear beyond peradventure what is meant by subsection 1 of section 3. We have heard many members of the government state that it is proposed that parliament shall be asked to appropriate sums of money for specific purposes. This section indicates, however, that—not for specific purposes at all, but out of a lump sum—appropriations may be made by the governor in council, and not by parliament. So that this much talked of parliamentary control vanishes; all we have left is that parliament votes one or ten millions as the case may be, and out of that, moneys are paid under agreements made by the governor in council, which is the practice that was so much condemned in the past. The only parliamentary control is with respect to the voting of the sum of money out of which these various works are to be undertaken.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the effective control. When parliament appropriates public moneys it knows what it is doing, but when the governor in council takes money out of the public treasury without any previous appropriation by parliament, parliament does not know what the government is doing. The result is as we now know to our cost, that millions of dollars have had to be accounted for when there is no longer possibility of any control, at the end of the year with respect to which parliament had no previous knowledge whatever. I think my right hon. friend laboured this point at great length just before the recess and was effectively answered at that time; moreover, the subsection passed before the recess. My right hon. friend sometimes accuses me of having an obsession, but I think this is becoming an obsession with him.

Mr. BENNETT: It is no obsession. I am simply pointing out that there is no appropriation by this parliament of moneys for specific undertakings.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There will be.

Mr. HEAPS: A little while ago the Minister of Labour spoke of a certain amount of farm labour being required in the west,