

to the oath of office taken individually by its members, delegate such powers to the executive.

In respect to one of these orders in council, the last one mentioned by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I wish to make some comments. I find that on the 16th December, 1931, the executive, the governor in council, passed an order in council diverting moneys to the establishing of an additional number of Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said 200, but I think that must have been a slip on his part. He does not often make slips like that, but as a matter of fact the number was 300, or an increase of one-third. Then he argued that this order in council was made necessary by an agreement entered into by Alberta and another province in respect of policing. I challenge the hon. gentleman in that regard. This order in council was passed on the 16th December, 1931, and no agreement, even with Alberta, was entered into until the end of January, 1932.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: And no agreement with Manitoba was contemplated at that time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am now informed that no agreement with Manitoba was even contemplated at that time. I say to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and to the house, that this order in council does not indicate in any way anything that would justify his allegation that it was for the policing of Alberta or any other province. The fact is, as he must know, that it was for the purpose of increasing the personnel of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police under the jurisdiction of this administration. The money diverted amounts to quite a sum, more than a quarter of a million dollars diverted to the addition of 300 men to the force and, amongst other things, to the purchase of bombs, riot equipment. Imagine money alleged to be voted for the purpose of unemployment and farm relief being diverted, as we now find, to the purchase of riot equipment, bombs, artillery, ammunition, additional horses, including \$1,750 to pay twenty special agents! Another item is \$20,000 of unemployment relief funds used for the general expenses of secret investigations by the police force. That may all be justified, but it certainly was not what parliament was led to believe last year. This type of legislation by order in council is unjustifiable, and it should always be submitted to parliament. Above all others, a type of legislation involving the peace, order and good government of Canada should be submitted to parliament itself.

I said a moment ago that this statute would give to the executive greater powers than had ever been given to any executive in the country before. I say it advisedly. I challenge hon. gentlemen to study the War Appropriation Act where some \$50,000,000 was voted, and the amount was stated definitely, for past appropriations made by governor generals' warrants for requirements prior to the sitting of parliament.

The next is the War Measures Act. It did not give the government of the day any right whatever to appropriate sums of money for war purposes, not one cent. Not even during the war crisis, the greatest with which this country was ever faced—not excepting the present one, although this closely parallels it so far as suffering is concerned—was the House of Commons asked to divest itself of constitutional customs. All the appropriations for the carrying on of the war were voted in the estimates annually and discussed by this house annually.

Sir EUGENE Fiset: Under the name of war appropriations.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly, and the fullest discussion was afforded before the money was voted except in regard to the war appropriations bill, which was for commitments entered upon prior to the sitting of parliament.

When the Prime Minister spoke the other day he made a very good case. He spoke eloquently, as he always does, and signified that we ought to be proud of the fact that under the act of last session work had been provided to something over three hundred thousand men. They had been provided with six million hours of work. It sounded splendid. The Prime Minister said six million hours. I am sure he must have been mistaken. He possibly meant six million days, but I take the statement as recorded in Hansard and as I heard him say it. Six million hours' work for three hundred thousand men gives them exactly twenty hours' work during the six months period of operation of the act that we were being asked to consider. At the rate of thirty cents per hour, which is the rate paid in part of my province, twenty hours' work gives them six dollars for six months' work. That is something that we ought to be very proud of! May I say right now that if I have any complaint in regard to the unemployment relief scheme it is certainly not on the ground of extravagance on the part of the government, but on the ground that the government has not taken the neces-