

employment to several hundred men for several weeks longer; it would be proposed, at the same unit cost, to continue that work. With respect to public works and similar undertakings, the government has considered no claims of that character at the moment, because I am bound to say as I think my hon. friend will agree, that the estimates passed last session were very generous in their appropriation of public moneys, and we are endeavouring to see that those moneys are expended with a view to providing employment.

This statement of the Prime Minister would seem to me to be a direct contradiction of the policy laid down by the Minister of Public Works. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not in the chamber; if he were I would ask him why he allowed the Minister of Public Works to make that statement.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I did not make a statement.

Mr. POWER: I would ask the Prime Minister why he allowed the Minister of Public Works to give the committee the impression this afternoon that none of these moneys were being expended primarily for the purpose of unemployment. Now we find that his leader has laid down that not only were the moneys which were voted last year for public works to be expended, but we were to get something more out of the \$20,000,000. That is the situation which the Prime Minister outlined to us at the special session. He said: If there is not enough money left out of the appropriation made in the main session of 1930, we will give you more out of the \$20,000,000. Instead of following that policy the hon. minister now says: I am going to save that money.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): No, he did not say so.

Mr. POWER: He said: In the province of Quebec I will spend \$1,500,000 less; in Nova Scotia, so much less; in New Brunswick, so much less; in Prince Edward Island, so much less, and in Manitoba, so much less. As a matter of fact his leader laid down the principle that the first moneys to be expended out of that \$20,000,000 were to be applied to continue the erection of public works which were then being undertaken. It seems to me that there is a decided difference between the policies of the right hon. Prime Minister and his Minister of Public Works. In a way I am glad the Prime Minister is not here, because with his usual politeness—may I say?—he might tell the minister that it would have been better for him not to have made the statement which he has made this afternoon. The Prime Minister might have said it more

[Mr. Power.]

harshly. In all sincerity I suggest to the minister that he discuss this matter fully with his leader and that he get his leader's assent to any statement he may make in the house. Otherwise when his leader reads Hansard—

Mr. SPENCE: You are going too far, and you know it.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend gives me credit for more generosity than I possess.

Mr. SPENCE: You are just putting on a show.

Mr. POWER: I had the honour and the pleasure of listening to my hon. friend for many years when I was on the other side of the house, and much as I appreciate the courtesy he has always shown us, I think I may remind him that I never have been lacking in courtesy to members on his side. I may tell him that if I stress this matter with the Minister of Public Works it is because the country wants to know just where we are getting. Time and again in this house policies are announced, or it is said that we are going to have an announcement of policy, or there is a splurge in the newspapers, then Humpty Dumpty marches up the hill—only to march down again. That is the situation we have confronting us, and we are spending less on unemployment to-day than under any other administration.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has quoted from Hansard, and quoted quite correctly; but the Prime Minister did not intend to, and did not do, more than indicate possible lines of expenditure for this money. If my hon. friend will look at the statute he will find it is provided that the money shall be disposed of by order in council in such way as may be directed. So there was no absolute or definite commission to expend any part of this \$20,000,000 on public works as such.

Mr. POWER: Does my hon. friend mean to insinuate that his leader was not definite on anything?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Of course not. As my hon. friend knows, the Prime Minister is very definite and quite able to take care of himself. But if my hon. friend will follow the statute through, he will find that to be the fact, that that was simply an indication of how the money might be used. Subsequently a policy was evolved, and I believe the orders in council asked for have been laid on the table showing the lines on which