

did not believe that very good as that a lot of people make false affidavit. Louis Leduc told to Ferdinand Leduc to come away that "We are not going to make a false affidavit for five hundred dollars."

4. That the \$500 above mentioned was promised to us on the 25th day of July, A.D., 1930, on Friday night at our home.

(Signed) Louis Leduc.

(Signed) F. Leduc.

Sworn before me at the town of Chelmsford, in the district of Sudbury, this 25th day of August, A.D., 1930.

(Signed) Louis Groulx.

A Com. &c.

I have special reasons, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this matter before the house. We are being asked to vote money in blank to this government. I believe that this government has good intentions, but in turn it will hand over some of this money to the government of Ontario, which I am convinced will railroad us, through the Northern Ontario Development branch. I would therefore urge the Prime Minister to consider the suggestion of the leader of the opposition that an official audit be made of the moneys appropriated by this government and expended by the provinces, so that we shall know just where the money goes and how much is expended in each place.

Mr. BOURASSA: A little more attention should be given to the question raised by the leader of the opposition and the ex-Minister of Justice. The government ought to know by now that I am not fostering any opposition to this measure or endeavouring to put any obstacles in their way. In absolute good faith did I enter into the spirit which inspired the government in calling this session to remedy a real and grievous situation. On the other hand, the history of all parliaments, and especially of British parliaments, teaches us that it is in times of panic or of great emergencies that parliaments are apt to forget basic principles of legislation and government. That was done during the war, by both parties, may I say? But this is no reason why, when extraordinary measures are proposed, some attention should not be given to the proper safeguards to be taken by parliament and its executive committee, the government, to preserve good principles of administration.

The objections raised by the leader of the opposition before we entered into this stage of the discussion ought not to be swept aside without any consideration, either from the viewpoint of parliamentary procedure or principles of government, or from a practical point of view. The leader of the government has expressed frequently during the various

phases of this debate his view—and I think it is right—that it is impossible to remedy this situation and to apply the money that is so to be voted by parliament in the ordinary way. In this I agree with him, and I stated so when the resolution was before the house. But as between setting aside some of the rules of procedure, and doing away with all the proper safeguards to see that this money will be employed properly, there is a wide margin. Not only so far as the rights of this parliament as representing the people are concerned, but even for the safety of the government itself, some of those safeguards should be preserved.

I have followed pretty attentively the whole debate. Questions were put; objections were made. The leader of the government gave much evidence of his good will and his patience in listening and answering in his dual and triple capacity as Prime Minister, as Minister of Finance and as representing the Labour department. I thank him for it and I congratulate him. But what is to come out of all these half open doors? None is closed and none frankly open. Municipalities may apply through their provincial governments or, if they do not find sufficient support from their provincial governments, they may apply to this government direct.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. BOURASSA: Oh, yes.

An hon. MEMBER: No. The channel is the provincial government, I think the Prime Minister said.

Mr. BOURASSA: In cases where a municipality does not find the provincial support that it might have expected from its government it may have a hearing direct. And I think it is right. Supposing, for example, a municipality applies, as I have cited one in my constituency, for help in the building of a branch line of railway; surely that application should not of necessity pass through the provincial authority. Supposing another municipality applies to this government to have a public building erected, to have a breakwater built, as the Prime Minister himself suggested; then surely in those matters they should not be obliged to pass their requests to the federal government through the provincial authority. As regards roads, there are roads that are purely municipal—and I think the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) made the distinction—while others are provincial in their character. Besides, the legislation with regard to highways varies with the provinces.