

Mr. BENNETT: Oh no, not in detail.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No public work was originated under this.

Mr. BENNETT: No, but the principle is the same. There is no difference in the principle.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh yes.

Mr. BENNETT: Not a bit. There is no difference in the principle of the allotment of \$900,000, if it were necessary, and the allotment of \$20,000,000 if it is necessary. As will be observed the expenditures were incurred antecedently to parliamentary sanction being given for payment. In this instance antecedent authority is being secured and payment is to be made afterwards. I think you will find that there is no question as to that fact. I thought my memory was accurate, but to make sure I looked through the estimates; I did not want to be too sure about it. There are very large sums of money which from time to time have to be expended by order in council, with the approval of the governor in council, for the administration of the government. Although hon. gentlemen now do not think very much of the principle, the agricultural grant as will be recalled was in a lump sum. The highways grant was in a lump sum; the grant for technical education was in a lump sum, and they were all for specific purposes, agriculture, technical education and highways. This is a grant for the specific purpose of unemployment. Of course if the hon. member for Lisgar and those associated with him have any fear that this might constitute a fund which would be available for expenditure as the government might deem desirable and without regard to parliament, surely any safeguard which these gentlemen would desire to impose would be welcomed by any administration, whatever it might be.

Mr. FACTOR: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Prime Minister a question? As one of the public works to be undertaken is it the intention of the government to erect a new main post office which is so badly needed in the city of Toronto. I suppose, from the silence of the Prime Minister, I may assume that he is not in a position to answer.

Mr. BENNETT: I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. FACTOR: Probably silence gives consent. Also I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question in reference to the elimination of level crossings. He suggests that the grade separation fund be supplemented and that municipalities make application to the railway board. In the case of the city of Toronto,

the railway board having already refused the application, what steps must be taken in order to eliminate the level crossings, particularly the two which the Minister of Railways must have in mind?

Mr. BENNETT: I am sure that the hon. gentleman whose first appearance in this house is so satisfactory to those who surround him, and whom we all welcome and are all delighted to hear, must realize that there is an appeal now pending by the city of Toronto from the judgment of the board, asking that the judgment by which the board declared that the city should bear the whole cost, and the railways and the fund nothing, might be set aside. I am therefore not in a position to discuss it as the appeal is taken to the governor in council.

Mr. FACTOR: One more question. Does the government intend to take any steps in the direction of using their influence with private interests to see that work is commenced during the coming months of depression?

Mr. BENNETT: I am happy to say that even in the month that has elapsed since we have been in power we have already done that, and we shall continue to do it. The gathering which took place at Ottawa on the 21st of August last, at which six provinces were represented by their premiers or ministers or deputy ministers, is an impressive indication of the interest of the provinces in the matter and of the spirit of cooperation that exists between the provinces and the Dominion in dealing with a national problem in a manner befitting the people of this country.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I did not exactly understand whether it was agreeable to the Prime Minister that any appropriations made from this \$20,000,000 should lapse as ordinary appropriations for public works lapse at the end of the fiscal year. From the answer he gave to my hon. friend from Lisgar, I rather gathered that he had no objection to that course. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, with the additional observation which I made to the right hon. leader of the opposition, that obligations contracted and not paid—the hon. gentleman will remember the discussion that took place last year—would have to be payable out of that sum. I think the hon. member for Lisgar so understood it. Certainly the appropriation would lapse on the 31st day of March in respect of any balance that might remain after the payment of the obligations contracted under the operation of the act.