

vide a purely provincial work, unless it is meant that in every case in which money of the government of Canada is being expended this power should be exercised? But as the subsection reads, it certainly does not convey just that shade of meaning which is essential. As it reads it would give power, which would be a wholly invalid exercise of legislation, that a representative of the dominion should supervise purely provincial work.

Mr. ROGERS: Unquestionably the purpose of the subsection is to provide for such supervision in relation only to contracts for work to which the dominion government has contributed. I think that is made clear by reading the entire section:

The governor in council may out of moneys appropriated by parliament authorize the execution of such works—as the governor in council may determine.

Then it speaks of carrying on works in conjunction with the provinces. Highways are under provincial jurisdiction, and that has been the direction in which relief works have been carried out in conjunction with the provinces in past years. I am not suggesting that relief works have been confined wholly to highways, but certainly larger expenditures have been made in that direction than in any other.

Mr. MacNICOL: Another example of work that might be carried on between the provinces and the dominion, would be any kind of reforestation.

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Should not some words be inserted after the word "jurisdiction," then? Is the minister satisfied that this wording covers exactly the intention of the government? I would suggest that after the word "jurisdiction" be added "and to which the dominion government is contributing."

Mr. BENNETT: I do not think there is any doubt as to what the minister desires to say. What I am pointing out is that I think he says much more than he intends to say. I think, as the subsection reads, he is subjecting to federal supervision contracts of a purely provincial character and the exercise of the legislative power would be involved, unless it were implied as a condition to any grant that is made, which I have always felt is wholly within the power of this parliament to do.

Mr. ROGERS: If the language does not cover it I shall be glad to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STEWART: Subsection 2 of this section is very interesting indeed. It reads:

In the execution of any such work or undertaking provision shall be made, so far as it may be in the opinion of the governor in council practicable and consistent with reasonable efficiency and economy to do so, for the employment of persons who being available and competent are necessarily and properly in receipt of relief in the province in which such work or undertaking is to be performed.

I wonder how the minister thinks he is going to carry that out. I remember that when we had a public works construction act the hon. member for Lambton West was very specific and definite in some suggestions he had to make. I think he had eight or ten different headings; he had returned soldiers, married men with dependents, married men without dependents, residents of the particular municipality in which the work was to be carried on, and so on. I wonder if he would make some of those suggestions now in order to make this bill a little more specific and definite. Really this is a desirable provision, but it seems to me that it is practically incapable of any real, definite application. I should like to know how the minister thinks he can carry that out, and through what agencies he hopes to succeed in carrying it out.

Mr. ROGERS: I am not going to suggest to my hon. friend that I have a complete answer to his question now; no doubt I shall learn something from experience. Perhaps he will agree with this, however, that it is highly desirable that where we are contributing to relief works we should, so far as possible, employ able-bodied persons who are on relief. In the agreements with the provinces with respect to the construction of the trans-Canada highway, for example, there are certain provisions which do require that a quota of the employees on such work shall be taken through the employment offices. As I recall it there is no specific requirement that they shall have been previously on relief, but I am not at all sure that the time has not come to link up our relief works more definitely with our relief rolls. I may say also to my hon. friend that it has been brought to my attention that certain contracts touching sections of highway in different parts of Canada, to which the dominion government has contributed, have been carried out in such a way as to suggest very strongly that there has been too little regard for their effect upon relief rolls, either in the particular district or in the entire province. I would go at least as far as to say that the existing conditions have not been wholly satisfactory, and I think it highly desirable that in work-