

parliament is now being asked to spend \$20,000,000 for two purposes: (a) to provide useful work suitable so far as possible to engage the energies of the unemployed; (b) to provide for relief for those for whom there is no work, and who are unable to find useful work. I have said that several times; I repeat it, and I hope it is satisfactory.

The question as to the extent to which the money will be used will depend upon the necessities that arise for its use. So far as public works are concerned, using the word in the broad sense, they will undoubtedly provide employment for some, not all; but every one knows, or should know, that if you put money into circulation for useful purposes it will increase the demands for food; it will give employment to restaurants; it will give employment to those who have to provide the necessities not only of food but of clothing of those who are so employed. Economists tell us that every dollar that is put into circulation will probably lead to ten or twenty dollars being put into circulation in the communities in which that dollar is spent. It is for that reason that we cannot with exactness say whether or not the classes to which the right hon. gentleman referred would directly benefit; but it is conceivable that that may happen, and in my judgment it will happen. That is, if a public work is undertaken in a community where there is considerable unemployment of one class, and that class thereby finds employment, then there will be a reaction of course, for the benefit of other classes who are also unemployed. By reason of the fact that employment is given to the workers in class A, the workers in other classes will benefit from the result of that employment. In other words, moneys will circulate through the productive effort of those who are paid for their services, and enure to the benefit of other classes in the community, both men and women, whether they be clerks, stenographers, of whom more will be required in offices, in the counting rooms, or those who work in restaurants, or those who provide food or clothing. That has been the experience of the world, and no one knows it better than the right hon. gentleman himself. It is for that reason that the primary purpose of our effort is work. That is the primary purpose, I repeat. But we realize that a condition may and will arise in this country, not only to-day but perhaps during the winter, as it arose in 1919-1920, and in order that there might be no doubt as to the right to apply a portion of this money to relief purposes to assist the provinces and the

municipalities, provision in that regard is made. I do not know that I can usefully add anything to that statement. I have already said it so frequently that I trust I shall not be asked to repeat it, although I shall do so if it is desired. The grant is to be used for two purposes, I repeat; primarily, to provide work and to assist the municipalities and the provinces which are providing work; and secondly, for the purpose of providing relief, if unhappily, that becomes a necessity.

As to whether or not this money will be exhausted by the 31st day of March, that depends, as I have already said, upon circumstances and conditions that are beyond the foresight of any member of this house. That is clear. If the money is not exhausted by the time parliament next meets, obviously it will be still available. But in any event it is also clear that in preparing estimates for 1931-1932, parliamentary appropriations would be sought through the committee of supply rather than by this bill, which is not in any sense a supply bill in the technical sense of the term. It will be recalled that the government in 1919-1920 made an appropriation by warrant of a small sum of money to meet the situation, and then, of course, sought parliamentary sanction for the additional moneys expended for the purposes of relief during that period.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Did they do it through a special bill or through the estimates?

Mr. BENNETT: My memory is, through the estimates. Having regard to the attitude taken by the right hon. gentleman as to the desirability of having antecedent parliamentary sanction for expenditures, I am sure that he will agree that any effort to appropriate so substantial a sum as that mentioned in the resolution should have parliamentary sanction before the money is expended. I think that is a cardinal principle of representative institutions and of responsible government.

Now, if there is anything I can usefully add to that summary of the situation, I shall be glad to do it. But there it is, just as I have mentioned, and I repeat: we are not endeavouring to provide for classes but for the unemployed, and we are doing it by the method that I have indicated. I can do nothing more than repeat what I think might fairly be said—shall I say?—to be a reasonably clear explanation of the purposes in mind, having regard to the inability of anyone to speak of a situation or condition that might arise from time to time. There must be elasticity. If you have no flexibility in the administration of such a fund obviously great hardships might arise, and to meet that words