

The first policy of the federal government with regard to relief was that of public works. My constituency includes all the drought area of the province of Manitoba, and in one year some \$46,000 was spent on public works in that area. Subsequently the public works were carried on under the joint responsibility of the provincial and federal governments. There are many who say that this should have been continued, and I should like to state to the house why this policy was discontinued by the federal government. I should like to quote from two speeches which were made in this house. It will be remembered that in 1932 a dominion-provincial conference was held in Ottawa. The provincial premiers met here in secret but I shall quote from two speeches made in the House of Commons about that time. On May 4, 1932, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gordon) was introducing an act with respect to relief, and he referred to the dominion-provincial conference in the following words:

On April 8 the provincial premiers came to Ottawa and on what remained of that day and throughout the following day the whole situation was considered with a view to checking up on the work accomplished and to formulate a course for the future. I think I am stating it fairly when I say the premiers and those representing the provinces were unanimous in the decision that the provinces and the municipalities within those provinces were financially unable for any length of time to carry on the program of public works projected, or to carry out the scheme formulated since the last session of parliament.

That is why the public works program was discontinued at that time. On November 22 of the same year the Prime Minister was speaking on unemployment, and he is reported at page 1455 of Hansard for 1932-33 as follows:

This I should like to say, not to anticipate what will be said by the Minister of Labour at the appropriate time. Last spring the government called a meeting of representatives of the provinces, who concluded that it was not expedient to continue their efforts for relief along the lines that had prevailed theretofore. They decided they would have recourse to direct relief. The conference was very well attended; half a dozen of our ministers were there, and that conclusion having been arrived at, the action indicated was taken.

That is why we have been granting relief rather than carrying on a program of public works within the municipalities and the provinces. The amount of relief given is measured by the need of the locality. Those areas in the west where there has been the greatest drought for the greatest number of years naturally receive the greatest attention. In Manitoba we have an area known as drought area A where there has been no crop for

five years. This area was defined at a conference held in Ottawa at which I had the honour of attending. The provincial treasurer of Manitoba attended and I accompanied him at the request of the provincial government. Subsequently another area known as drought area B was defined, at another meeting at which I was not present. Those areas have been defined and treatment is given in that way and loans are advanced by the federal government for the purpose of supplying seed grain. This government pays one-half the freight on cattle, horses and equipment going out of that area, and also on their being ready to return to it the federal government pays fifty per cent of the freight. It pays fifty per cent of the freight on hay which is trucked into the area.

The loans for seed grain constitute one of the difficulties at the present time. The federal government has advanced recently to Manitoba, for the purpose only of the drought areas, these amounts:

November 15 last.	\$75,000
December 10 last.	75,000
February 9 last.	75,000

And under a recent order in council dated March 25, there has again been advanced to Manitoba the sum of \$275,000. Thus there has been advanced to that province since November 15 last, for the drought areas only, the sum of \$500,000, which is to be used for seed grain, feed and relief, and for present purposes that amount seems quite adequate. In addition to that the federal government has, as I have indicated, paid for freight in regard to feed and equipment for the drought areas a sum amounting to \$77,264. That in itself is a large sum. In toto, for relief and other purposes, the federal government has advanced to Manitoba now between \$13,500,000 and \$14,000,000, which at the present time has not been paid back. There are those who say from time to time: What is the federal government doing in regard to direct relief? May I point out what it is doing in those areas in Manitoba. First in regard to direct relief it is paying its one-third; it is advancing to Manitoba the one-third payable by that province, and it is advancing to Manitoba the other one-third which the province in turn hands over to the municipalities. The resultant picture is therefore that the federal government is paying outright one-third; it is lending the other two-thirds, and has as a consequence one hundred per cent of the responsibility in that regard. As I have said, the federal government has advanced to my province for relief and other purposes be-