

been able to study carefully the different clauses contained in it; but I think there is considerable question as to the extent to which the Dominion Government is justified in undertaking work which really belongs to the Provincial Governments. The development of that policy may lead us a very long way; it may lead us into a position that we do not really appreciate at the present time. As most of the Provincial Governments find it difficult to raise money at the present time, and as the Dominion Government seem to be so well satisfied that they can get all the money they want, and that there is no need to restrict expenditure, I suppose the Government feel quite justified in placing a Bill of this kind before Parliament. But I think we should be careful as to how we vote large sums of this kind, when honourable gentlemen on this side of the House have a certain amount of difficulty in finding out where and how the money is to be raised. There is a danger, if we go on borrowing large sums of money for the purpose of spending it, that we may place heavier burdens on the people of the country than they will be able to bear. I can quite understand that the Provincial Governments are in favour of legislation of this kind, because it practically amounts to an extra subsidy. It is rather a question, I think, as to whether the Dominion Government is justified in granting additional subsidies to the provinces in this way, and whether the unemployment throughout the country is quite as serious as the remarks of the leader of the Government would lead us to believe. I am not quite satisfied as to that. The minority report of a commission in regard to this matter, which was laid before the House a few days ago, would not lead us to think that the unemployment situation was so serious as to require assistance at this time.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Honourable gentlemen, for my part I am absolutely opposed to this Bill, root and branch. It is only another sample of tremendous extravagance in the use of the public funds of this country. We had several other instances in the Budget—a vote for an enormous expenditure in the city of Toronto, and another in the city of Montreal, to replace buildings that are still useful, and that by slight additions could be made useful for many years to come, by erections that will cost millions in each instance. These things should give us pause before we rush into an expenditure of this kind.

We are proposing by this measure to vote \$20,000,000 to be expended, not by the Federal authorities, but by the provincial authorities to whom the money is to be handed over. That in itself is wrong in principle. If this money is voted by this Parliament, if it is to be raised by the tax gatherers of the Federal authorities, it should be expended by the Federal authorities instead of being handed over in this way.

Apart from all that, I say that we have not been shown the necessity of passing this huge vote. Unemployment has been spoken of. How can there be the unemployment that is spoken of in general terms by the leader of the House when we find strikes going on in almost every city in Canada? When there is unemployment you do not find strikes. To-day men are ceasing employment because they want higher wages or for other reasons. That is not the case when there is general unemployment throughout the country. So I say there is no evidence of any unemployment to justify an expenditure of this kind.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: And this would not relieve it.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: And this would not relieve the situation even if it does exist. If this is to give employment to the returned soldier, let me say that his answer, when we offered him this employment, would be that for the last three or four years he had spent the major portion of his time with pick and shovel digging ditches in Flanders, and that he would not thank you for this kind of work. Therefore I do not think that a vote of this kind is necessary.

Furthermore, I say that this is not the time to go into this expenditure; and it is my purpose to do more than raise my voice against it. I propose to move that this Bill be not now proceeded with, but that it be taken up six months hence.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: At the fall session?

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Honourable gentlemen, ever since I heard of this Bill I have been opposed to it. I do not want to raise any technical or narrow objection to the Bill, but I should like to point out that while it may not be illegal, it is certainly outside the spirit of the Confederation contract. We all know that the powers of the Dominion and the powers of the provincial Parliaments are very carefully separated, and that in subjects like immigration and