

they will be given sympathetic consideration by the government. It seems to me that matters not as important as this have been deemed worthy of consideration by the committee of the whole house, and I do not see why there should be the suggestion from the leader of the opposition, who has taken time for some matters not as important in my opinion as this, that this is not worthy of consideration by the committee of the whole house.

Mr. BENNETT: It would have to come back to the committee of the whole house.

Mr. TUCKER: Well, that is no reason why the matter should be put into the hands of a special committee which, if it is to hear witnesses at all, will be subjected to pressure to hear others than members of the house. I do not see how the committee could possibly refuse to hear witnesses who wished to appear. People will say, Why should members alone be permitted to give evidence? And once the matter is opened up, as the Minister of Finance has said, there will be a drive to have this act repealed. I think the government have been wise to open this in a restricted way and keep it restricted. Any amendments worth while can be suggested in committee of the whole house, will have sympathetic consideration and will be dealt with promptly, and this procedure will save the whole matter from becoming a subject of controversy all over the country.

Mr. W. G. CLARK (York-Sunbury): I am in favour of the view expressed by the hon. member who suggested that this could be dealt with in committee of the whole house. As far as my province is concerned I am sure that this act has been a detriment from the beginning, and the desire of our province is to have it discontinued. But we would like to have the matter settled one way or the other during this session.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be considered by the committee of the whole?

Mr. DUNNING: At the next sitting, I think, because I should like to give consideration to what has been said. There has not been a broad expression of opinion from many members, but I should like to give consideration to what has been said before the bill is again discussed. I am certainly impressed with the seriousness of the difficulties surrounding the act, and I am anxious to pursue a course which will develop something constructive, although I am quite sure

that no course can be followed by this parliament which will satisfy either extreme view. It is quite impossible to do that. Of course we may land in the position where we succeed in satisfying no one, but I am quite sure that we can succeed in improving the position of the unfortunates of both classes, creditors and debtors.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Dunning moves that the bill be not now referred to the committee of the whole, but that it be referred at the next sitting of the house.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF—STATEMENT OF MR. ROSS (ST. PAUL'S) ON MOTION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, as it has been the practice in parliament from time immemorial for members to present the grievances of their constituents before supply is granted, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to present the grievances of my constituents with respect to the policy of the government in the distribution of the money voted by parliament for grants in aid, as it affects my constituents in regard to providing funds for unemployment relief. This is a matter of grave urgency, and affects not only my riding of St. Paul's but the city of Toronto and the province of Ontario.

Let us consider the statement of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Rogers). On Wednesday, February 23, there appeared in the Ottawa Journal a report of a statement purported to have been made by the hon. minister. It is headed, "Irresponsible Threats Futile." In this statement the Minister of Labour is reported to have said:

Nothing will be gained by irresponsible threats in the discussion of the relief problem in Ontario.

I do not know what "irresponsible threats" were made, other than that the federal government would have to take care of the relief for the increasing number of those unemployed needing relief, and that in the event of the federal government not providing funds for this purpose, the municipalities would be unable to do so and the unemployed would have to take the consequences. Why should they be the goat, when this matter is none of their making? I wish to register my protest.

The minister refers to "irresponsible threats." It seems to me it shows rather a lack of