

my argument around. My argument was in accordance with the one advanced by the right hon. leader of this party (Mr. Mackenzie King), that whatever money this parliament spends should be spent under its own control. My remarks appear in Hansard of Friday, and here is what I said:

To-night the Prime Minister advanced the best argument that I have heard as to why the act should be amended.

I was referring to the British North America Act.

The right hon. gentleman said that if we state a definite amount in this bill the provinces will clamour for what they think is coming to them; even if they need only \$2,000,000 if there is \$20,000,000 to be divided they will want their share. I think the Prime Minister was right in that argument; I agree with him, and that is just another reason why we in this federal parliament should take care to see to it, when we are spending money, that we spend our own money over which we have control.

If the Prime Minister can get any consolation out of those statements, I am glad to let him have it. The argument I advanced is that which has been advanced continually by the opposition, that when we are spending money we should spend our own money and should take control over it. If the government had carried out their promises to the electors they would have taken control and assumed the obligation of unemployment and unemployment relief. The government told the people in 1930 that they would make it a national obligation and they received a mandate from the people to take over unemployment and unemployment relief as a national obligation. Will anyone contend that the government of Quebec or of any other province would object to this government taking over full control of and assuming full responsibility for unemployment relief? I am certain that no government would object. The fact that we have this bill before us in 1934, four years after this government was elected to end unemployment, is the best proof that the policies of this government have failed. A policy that has been put into effect by this government and that has lost trade to the extent of \$1,768,000,000 in four years, must have been a poor policy and one not in the best interests of Canada. Surely the policies of a government that has lost trade to that extent in four years, that has added four hundred million to the debt of this country and that has increased taxation until the people are overburdened with it, cannot be good for this dominion. Therefore I repeat that this government has from time to time changed its ideas and its policies, and the worst feature of the matter is that it has not

carried out its direct promise that if it did not do these things it would perish in the attempt.

I do not need to repeat that those who need relief, those who are working under relief measures, are getting by all odds the small end of the deal, and this government, not content with bringing in a measure of this kind for unemployment relief and having it administered by the province of Ontario in the way it has been, have coupled with it the peace, order and good government provision and all those other matters that have no connection with an unemployment relief measure. I agree entirely with the leader of the C.C.F. party in asking: Why include in the relief measure the peace, order and good government provision and ask for additional powers to maintain peace and order in this country over and above what already exists on the statute books. I contend that while the government are handing out relief with one hand, in the other we have a bludgeon that if the people do not like the relief, then they must be quite subservient and take what is handed to them by the Conservative government or suffer the consequences.

Then this government takes power—and I would not mind if it lived up in some way to the powers that we give it—to make regulations. In connection with the fact that I stated a moment ago that the labour men got the small end of these things, I want to point out that the Minister of Labour—and of course that means the government—has changed his position in regard to the wages that are to be paid to men engaged on these works. If we take the report of the dominion director of unemployment for 1930, there will be found on page 15 regulation No. 7 which reads as follows in connection with the wages that are to be paid:

7. All agreements made with provincial or municipal authorities involving the expenditure of any portion of the moneys appropriated by the act for public works or undertakings shall contain provisions for the payment of fair wages and hours of work in accordance with the intent of the Fair Wages and Eight-Hour Day Act, 1930, and the fair wages policy of the government of Canada as set forth in order in council (P.C. 1206) dated 7th June, 1922, and amendments thereto.

That is what is known as a minimum wage, a fair wage, but at any rate it works out as a minimum wage. According to the report of the dominion director of unemployment relief for 1932, that policy is entirely changed, because we find among the general regulations clause 8 on page 3 as follows:

The federal government will require that a maximum work day of eight hours shall prevail on works and undertakings carried on under the provisions of the Unemployment