

All agreements with provincial and municipal authorities shall contain a provision to the effect that all persons employed on the works or undertakings referred to herein shall be residents of Canada, and so far as practicable of the locality in which the work is being performed, and in no case shall discrimination be made or permitted in the employment of, or in the granting of direct relief to any British subjects by reason of their political affiliations, race or religious views.

Would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that of the \$216,442 expended under that order in council on harbours and rivers, if I have the figures correctly only \$12,000 was spent in ridings not represented by supporters of this government?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): You are wrong in that.

Mr. ELLIOTT: My hon. friend says I am wrong; I know he must think so, but of course I think not. It is a bit difficult to tell where some of these places are, but I have done my very best, and I know where most of them are located. One of my hon. friends suggests that I know where Haileybury is, and that is so. It is not my purpose at this time to say anything as to whether or not these expenditures were necessary in the places where they were made; hon. members of this house have never had an opportunity of ascertaining from the minister in charge of these expenditures what was the need at the particular place, who were asking for it or what amount of relief was likely to be afforded by that particular vote.

My hon. friend has referred to the grant for Haileybury. The sum of \$17,809 appears to have been spent in Haileybury. I have no information which justifies my saying that that was not properly expended and that it was not needed, and I do not propose to make any such statement until I know. However, I do say that that is something which should never have appeared under the heading of unemployment relief. The house sat last year until August 3, and this order in council was passed on October 15. Would it have been too much to ask the government to bring down an item in the estimates for public works and to give every hon. member an opportunity of discussing this matter before a decision was arrived at?

My objection to the substitution of "May" for "March" is that it is, in principle, the wrong kind of legislation. No hon. member can go home and face his constituents and justify the fact that while the house was still in session he sat in his seat, with his hands folded, and said: "I will leave this to the executive; it can do this in the way in which

it has been done in the past, although I am bound to say that that way has not proven satisfactory to many portions of the country."

The experience gained in the last year or two should have enabled some changes and some improvements to be made. Such experience should be of value in formulating a policy for the coming year. If the government would say what amount was needed and this house had an opportunity of discussing the proposed policy in the regular way, surely some good would come from the discussion. This matter should be discussed in committee of supply.

I do not propose to take up the time of the house at any length, but I do desire to point out that this is the most objectionable legislation which any parliament could enact. I realize that we are living in a strenuous period, but that is all the greater reason why the safeguards which the experiences of various free governments have thrown around the rights of the people should be preserved. I submit that this resolution should not pass but that a supply bill containing the necessary items and providing a means of discussion as to whether or not such items are necessary, is the proper method of procedure. I see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Stewart) across the floor, and I contend that all work in the way of public works should be done by his department. I have great faith in what can be accomplished by the Department of Public Works, and whatever money is to be expended on public works by the Dominion of Canada should be expended under the supervision of that department.

A cursory glance at the item will show that \$12,000 out of \$216,000 was spent in ridings which apparently needed no relief and which unfortunately are represented by opponents of the government. Perhaps these ridings do not need as much relief as do the ridings represented by supporters of the government.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): London got some.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I do not think the minister claims paternity for these estimates; I take it they were put into his hands. I hope that is the fact because I should not like to think they had been prepared by him. It seems a bit remarkable that when a Conservative government is in power, not only is there more relief needed for the country as a whole but the ridings represented by supporters of the government require six times as much relief as the ridings represented by those opposed to the government.

At six o'clock the house took recess.