

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: So far as direct relief is concerned.

Hon. Mr. LOGAN: Last night, in referring to the protection of the fund, the honourable gentleman used the following language:

The greatest safeguard in the expenditure of this fund is the fact that for every dollar spent by the Federal Government the municipality and the province must also spend their money.

Is that right, or is it wrong?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: That is right.

Hon. Mr. FORKE: Would those entitled to old age pensions come in under this regulation in any way?

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: No.

Section 2 was agreed to.

On section 3—purposes to which grant may be applied:

Some Hon. SENATORS: Carried!

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Before section 3 carries—

Hon. Mr. SCHAFFNER: Carried!

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Not yet. Before section 3 is carried, I wonder if I might impose upon the Minister of Labour by asking him to give me a little assistance in a matter with which he has had many years' pleasant association and is in whole-hearted sympathy. It may be that there are some reasons why he cannot at this time and in this place co-operate with me in having something done that I think should be done, and that I think it would be a great mistake to leave undone. For thirty years a fair wages policy has been in effect for the benefit of the workmen of Canada, particularly workmen who are beneficiaries of any moneys expended by the Federal Government. It would appear to me to be a retrograde step to pass this Bill without some recognition of the fair wages policy that this Parliament has stood for during the past thirty years, and I am going to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Labour to move, so that I may second it, an amendment to section 3 with which I know he is personally in sympathy. It is to add a subsection reading in this way:

All undertakings by the provinces or municipalities on any public works, or other undertakings for the relief of unemployment, shall as to wages and hours conform to the fair wages policy of this Parliament.

I hope that my honourable friend will be able to accept that and propose it. Outside of this Chamber I could leave a matter of

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT.

that kind entirely to his care, feeling confident that he would whole-heartedly support the principle which I have endeavoured to express in these few words.

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: I think the honourable gentleman should move it himself.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Assuming that a definite portion of this money is to go directly to labouring men in the form of wages, which is the better: to bind the Government to a high wage, or the standard Government wage, and to employ say 5,000 men, or to give half the wages and double the number of men employed?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: My honourable friend is asking me if half a loaf is better than no bread. I would answer him by saying that for twenty years, at least, the Minister of Labour and I have been in close and friendly association, working together in confidence many times, with little or no disagreement, in support of the contention that a fair wage and a stated number of hours of work per day were proper for workingmen, and I do not think that we should now take advantage of the misfortunes of the unemployed. I think it would be criminal for us to do that. So I am asking the Minister of Labour to move in this matter.

Hon. Mr. ROBERTSON: We all remember our school days. One of the things that I remember very well from the time when I went to school was the learning of a certain little poem that began: "Will you walk into my parlour?" I appreciate the manner in which my honourable friend has approached this question, but I am sure that he is just as convinced as I am that it is not within the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament to enact the legislation that he seeks. An amendment similar to this was submitted to the House of Commons and discussed there at length. It was supported by gentlemen who, like my honourable friend and myself, are earnest in their desire to help the working people. But in contemplating the Federal Parliament imposing its will upon a municipality or a province, or both, one must consider just what our rights in the premises are. It is my understanding and belief that no legislation that the Federal Government might pass in reference to the domestic affairs of a municipality situated a thousand or two thousand miles away would be binding.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: You could attach that as a condition.