

ment relief as the making of funds available for expenditure on other works. For instance, under the statute the department has the power to make contracts for public buildings. We may enter into a contract to complete a building by July 1 of next year. Yet the contractor is his own master; he alone controls the number of men he employs, where he will secure his material, and when he will do the work. For those reasons the department would be unable to give that measure of relief to unemployment which might reasonably be expected.

Mr. HEENAN: I agree that there is good reasoning in the argument of the minister. But may I point out that it was a Conservative government which first laid down the principle—by order in council in 1920 and 1921—that unemployment was primarily the responsibility of the municipalities and the provinces. Foolishly I think, we followed suit—and I believe the only time I ever got into trouble was when I followed the example of my hon. friend. However, we proceeded with the building program, and received the thanks of the unemployment conference held in Winnipeg in 1930. We thought that if federal moneys were spent on federal projects and the provinces and municipalities respectively followed a similar course, we would arrive at the same result as is now suggested by my hon. friend. For instance, in Toronto, which, with the exception of the constituency of Toronto West Centre represented by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Factor) is not a Liberal stronghold, we let a contract for a public building aggregating about \$3,000,000. At that time there was a great deal of unemployment in Toronto, and the contract provided a considerable amount of labour. The point I wish to make is—

Mr. GEARY: Is that the reason my hon. friend let that contract?

Mr. HEENAN: I agree that the municipalities could probably better tell us where unemployment exists. The government has taken the credit of appropriating \$20,000,000 for the relief of unemployment. If however they save five or ten million dollars through not proceeding with public expenditures, that amount should be deducted from the amount for which they take credit.

Mr. FACTOR: Undoubtedly the minister is aware that the government owns the site at the northwest corner of Oxford street and Spadina avenue in the city of Toronto. That particular point happens to be in my constituency. I learn that the site was purchased

for the purpose of erecting a branch post office. The former government did not proceed with the building and now that the Conservative government is in power and the member for the locality has changed, I thought perhaps the minister would proceed with the building of the post office.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no revenue.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): That site was purchased some time ago. I do not know whether or not conditions in the city of Toronto, which have been rapidly changing, would warrant at the present time the construction of the building. However, the request of my hon. friend will be considered.

Mr. FACTOR: I wish to thank the minister for his courtesy, and would add that a post office building is very badly needed in that particular location.

Mr. POWER: In connection with the discussion which has taken place between the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for South Perth, I refer the minister to the debates of the last session concerning the expenditure of moneys under the vote of \$20,000,000. The Prime Minister is reported at page 65 of Hansard—

Sir EUGENE Fiset: Ex cathedra.

Mr. POWER: Yes, speaking ex cathedra, and with all the infallibility of which he is capable. The extract is as follows:

It is proposed that this money shall be utilized just as the conference held in Ottawa concluded in their resolutions that they should be used. That body being a non-political one, we propose in the broadest and most proper sense of the term to follow that course in dealing with these moneys.

First there are national undertakings which this country may embark upon—public undertakings, buildings, wharves, piers that might not be constructed until next summer, but a portion of which work might well be done now instead of then. There might be the extension of existing contracts in connection with public undertakings.

Then he states further:

There are public undertakings which provinces and municipalities will engage in, but which otherwise they would not engage in until perhaps a year from now.

Giving an instance of the work which might be carried on under the vote of \$20,000,000, the Prime Minister is reported at page 67 of Hansard as follows:

I will give an illustration of what I think my hon. friend will at once see covers the case. Work is being carried on in connection with the breakwater, we will say, at the head of the lakes—I give that as an illustration—the parliamentary appropriation has been exhausted; the work could be usefully carried on and give