

me to be one of the serious cases where a province may ask that the dominion police assist in upholding the law.

Up to the present time there has been no official request for our assistance from the province of British Columbia, but I assure the hon. member that no doubt, in view of his remarks to-day, the request will come in due course. I shall be pleased to submit to my colleagues the observations he has made, and I think I may say that we will help in the matter all we can.

### SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

To provide for commitments under relief settlement agreements with provincial governments, \$400,000.

Mr. BENNETT: Does this vote cover existing obligations?

Hon. NORMAN McL. ROGERS (Minister of Labour): This item consists in part of existing obligations under relief settlement agreements with the provinces and in part of anticipated new obligations under the present agreements. Perhaps I could explain that in this way. The agreements provide for continuing payments to those who have been settled under the previous agreements and also for new settlements of families falling within the terms of the agreements. Therefore we are providing in part for expenditures to which we are committed and in part for anticipated expenditures during the coming year.

Mr. BENNETT: To what extent is this item referable to over-expenditures under existing agreements and to contemplated payment of new obligations?

Mr. ROGERS: There are no over-expenditures. It is a continuing contribution to the provinces which have agreements with the dominion government for relief settlements. If the leader of the opposition desires, I can place on Hansard the distribution of the money among the provinces. In 1936 Quebec received \$12,200; Ontario, \$1,400; Manitoba, \$69,500; Saskatchewan, \$10,000; Alberta, \$55,500; British Columbia, \$1,400, making a total of \$150,000. The new commitments total \$250,000, making a grand total of \$400,000.

Item agreed to.

To provide for federal contribution to provincial and municipal relief projects, \$7,331,000.

Mr. HEAPS: Would the minister give us a breakdown of this item?

[Mr. E. Lapointe.]

Mr. ROGERS: This total amount is broken down as follows. First, revote for claims to be rendered by the provinces under previous agreements which will not be received by the dominion in time to be paid before the close of the present fiscal year, \$1,316,117.75. Second, revote for the continuation of works authorized under previous agreements which will not be completed at the expiration of said agreements on March 31, 1937, \$514,269.04. Third, provision for new projects for relief measures during 1937-38, \$5,500,000.

Mr. CHURCH: What percentage will be provided for the municipalities?

Mr. ROGERS: That is a matter to be determined when we negotiate the agreements with the various provinces. It is not possible in advance of our consultation with the provincial governments to indicate definitely what percentage will be allocated for works in the municipalities.

Mr. MacINNIS: Would such works as the forestry camps in British Columbia come under this item?

Mr. ROGERS: They would come under another item which I will indicate when it is reached.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the work in connection with highway No. 8, to which I referred the other day, be included in this item?

Mr. ROGERS: I am advised by the officers of the department that that is not included in the list of the joint projects provided for under the last agreement with the province of Ontario.

Mr. LOCKHART: Is any portion of the cost of this highway being provided by the dominion government?

Mr. ROGERS: That is the information I receive from the officers of the department.

Mr. BARBER: There is considerable variation in the wages paid in the different municipalities for relief work. I had a letter the other day from a man who has been employed on relief work for three years and he tells me that he has received only \$20 a month, and he has to pay \$10 a month for rent. I understand that this particular municipality is receiving contributions on a fifty-fifty basis from the two governments. Is there not some way by which wages could be regulated so that they would be more nearly uniform? I do not know of two municipalities in my part of the country that pay the same rate.