

the Minister of Public Works in each province?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: My honourable friend will observe in paragraph a of section 4 the terms upon which this grant is to be made:

In accordance with the terms of an agreement to be made by the minister with the Government of the Province. Such agreement must be approved by the Governor in Council and shall contain such provisions as to location, cost, description, specifications, time and method of construction, supervision and other necessary particulars as are essential to protect the public interest.

Hon. Mr. BOURQUE: Do I understand that there will be an official of this Government to supervise the expenditure of this money?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes, I should say so.

Hon. Mr. BOURQUE: That is not mentioned in the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The language is ample enough to furnish the most elaborate machinery for the protection of the public interest.

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: I am opposed to the expenditure and to this Bill, for three or four reasons. I do not think the argument of the honourable member from Peel (Hon. Mr. Blain) should appeal very much to this House. That honourable gentleman brings a certain amount of party politics into his speech.

Hon. Mr. BLAIN: No, my honourable friend must not say that. He must speak for himself. May I give an emphatic denial to his statement?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: All right; I accept the honourable gentleman's statement. But I notice that the honourable gentleman opposed all the amendments that were made by the Senate in former years to similar Bills when it was proposed to spend the money exactly as this Bill proposes to expend it. Now, I do not want to say any more on that line, but I am opposed to the Bill for two or three reasons. One is that it is not a matter for the Dominion Government. The duty of looking after roads is a provincial and municipal matter; and if the province of Ontario is so anxious to have this money expended on roads, its share of it would be five or six million dollars, and that province can borrow the money just as cheaply as the Dominion Government can, if it has not the money

on hand, and build those roads; and the fact that the work is thrown on to the provincial governments and that those governments are more or less interested in it will tend to wasteful expenditure. That is the general outcome of joint jurisdiction over matters of that kind.

The second reason why I am opposed to the expenditure of this money is that we have not the money to spend. The Finance Minister estimates that we will have a revenue of 280 millions and an expenditure of 620 millions—340 millions more than our revenue. In the face of that expenditure of 340 millions more than our revenue. I ask this House if it is common sense to go into a 20 million expenditure that is not our business, that we are not called upon to make, and that will have questionable results? In my judgment, the only justification for voting this money would be in case it was going to furnish employment; but I venture the assertion that there are not in Canada to-day labouring classes who will handle the pick and shovel, who cannot get work if they want it. There is no unemployment in Canada for men of that class. You will not get the men in the cities to go out and perform that class of labour; and as was pointed out by one of the speakers, you will not get the returned soldiers to take up that class of work at the present time. Therefore it will not accomplish anything in that line. That being the case, why should we rush into voting 20 millions of dollars that we have not got and that we will have to borrow?

The honourable member for Middleton (Hon. W. B. Ross) has pointed out that the time is coming in the near future when we will be looking for money to pay back what we owe. Why should we be talking about the expenditure of millions under such circumstances? This highway project is just like the housing scheme, and I am opposed to it.

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON: I would like to ask if opposition to a money Bill was not considered out of order, as decided by the vote yesterday?

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: This is a different Bill altogether.

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON: I think the honourable gentleman who was in the Chair at the time ruled out of order an amendment of a money Bill. Now, this is entirely a money Bill, and I am waiting to know why the leader of the House has not called the attention of the Speaker to the