

has been discussed, yet by the most coercive and arbitrary act of which a government is capable, we are being prevented from discussing sections two and three of the measure and discussing at any further length the first section.

May I direct attention to this further fact: During this parliament, this house has had very little opportunity to discuss the question of unemployment and farm relief. There was very little opportunity afforded during the special session, and at the last session it was not until the concluding days in the month of July that the government brought down its measures with respect to unemployment relief. As hon. members know there was no opportunity then to discuss this matter. This year for the first time we have had or at least ought to have had some opportunity to discuss what is involved in this all important question.

What is the nature of the desired discussion? In the first place it is admitted by hon. gentlemen opposite that there has been an expenditure of over \$140,000,000 from the treasury of this dominion for unemployment and farm relief.

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. STEVENS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should say, along with those of the provinces.

Mr. STEVENS: And the municipalities.

Mr. MANION: And the railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will make it perfectly clear. The expenditure on unemployment and farm relief as taken out of the taxes of the people in one form or another has totalled over \$140,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: That is not correct.

Mr. MANION: The money expended by the railways was not taken out of the taxes of the people.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Railways (Mr. Manion) says that the part expended by the railroads was not taken out of the taxes of the people. I should like then to know where it came from.

Mr. MANION: The Canadian Pacific Railway Company spent a good deal of money which did not come out of the taxes of the people. That spent by the Canadian National Railways, perhaps, but the Canadian Pacific Railway, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not quibble over a few figures here or there. No

one can gainsay the statement that more money has been spent on unemployment relief since the present administration came into power than was required to run the entire government of Canada for a period of any one year during the time of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, or for a period of any two years during the time of Sir John A. Macdonald. That gives some appreciation of the extent to which the taxes of the people are being spent for this particular purpose.

We on this side, under a sense of our obligations, have been seeking to discover how that money has been spent. As it is only a preliminary to further expenditures, we have been seeking to ascertain what policies are going to govern the action of the government in the future. I submit that the discussion of a matter of such colossal proportions and so all-important to the taxpayers of this country should not be restricted under closure within a day and a half of the time it has been entered upon. Action so extreme in character has never been taken by any British government in regard to public taxation.

I will not add more at the moment, Mr. Chairman, except to say that it would be pure pretence for us to seek to take advantage in any way of the little right which remains to us under closure to ask but one question each of the Ministry with no guarantee that we will receive an answer. I think it better under the circumstances that we seek to prevent a waste of public moneys by attempting anything which is wholly futile. I shall content myself therefore, by saying that the action of the administration at the present time reduces parliament in its most essential functions to a mere futility and a complete farce, and that we of the opposition do not intend to lend ourselves to participation in any step of that kind.

Mr. BELL (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of this session, or, at least, from the time that the measure now before the committee was first introduced, we on this side have sat and listened to objections of various sorts, all of which were calculated to produce but one result—to stop the measures which had been put into effect by this government in order to relieve the unemployment situation in this country. We have heard from the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Mackenzie King) and from those who sit behind him, various suggestions as to why this legislation should be balked or brought to an improvident conclusion, but we have not heard, at least up to the time my right hon. friend took his seat, any suggestion why