

of any commission that may be set up to investigate the financial position of Alberta. Politics should have been left entirely out of the matter. Whether or not the social credit government of Alberta is a success is no business of the Bank of Canada. The Bank of Canada was set up for financial reasons. They should have reported on the actual conditions, and then this house could have decided whether or not the report should be accepted or whether or not assistance should be offered to the province of Alberta. I am convinced that there has been discrimination. I may be wrong, and because of that doubt I should like to read a few figures which were tabled in this house.

I shall quote first from sessional paper 261 which outlines the appropriations made by orders in council. These amounts were not handed over because of statutes passed by this house; they are not similar to the \$18,000,000 granted to Saskatchewan and the \$8,000,000 to Manitoba. These moneys were granted by orders in council. Under P.C. No. 278 Saskatchewan received \$5,005.44. Under P.C. No. 279 of February 4, Manitoba received \$2,214.74. Under P.C. No. 2137 of July 24, Alberta received \$21.69. Under P.C. No. 3835 of December 17 Alberta received \$3.79.

Mr. DUNNING: Is my hon. friend quoting from a statement of loans? I cannot identify the paper he is reading from.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): These are the amounts given under orders in council.

Mr. DUNNING: No.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): They were renewal loans made by the dominion to the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba since October 15, 1935.

Mr. DUNNING: The misunderstanding between my hon. friend and myself is that he says the moneys were given whereas, in fact, the moneys were loaned. There is a difference between a gift and a loan.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes, there is.

Mr. DUNNING: Alberta had the right to borrow under precisely the same authority and she did it to the extent that she desired. She was not debarred in any way. If there are no amounts there for Alberta, it is because she did not apply for them during that period.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The more credit to Alberta.

Mr. DUNNING: I am not trying to discredit Alberta.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I was just giving the moneys loaned to the provinces.

Mr. DUNNING: Surely my hon. friend should not quote those in an attempt to prove discrimination.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I notice that considerable emphasis was placed in the report on the road construction which has taken place in Alberta. The report criticized the province very severely for its road program. I should like to quote from an article which appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning with regard to the same type of construction in connection with which Alberta is criticized for spending too much. During the same period Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Ontario were spending much more than Alberta. I quote:

Nevertheless, expenditure on highways is a sound investment, and both provinces will be repaid in the long run. The tourist harvest is only in its infancy.

That referred to expenditures in Ontario and Quebec. The sort of expenditure for which Alberta was criticized by the report is advocated in this article as being a sound investment. I should like to quote from sessional paper No. 192A, being a return showing what sums of money were allotted by the federal government in 1936 on relief work projects in connection with the various provincial governments, and what sum has been allotted by the federal government to each separate province for such projects. The figures given are as follows:

Nova Scotia.. . . . .	\$ 25,000
Quebec.. . . . .	346,772
Ontario.. . . . .	372,133
Manitoba.. . . . .	266,667
Saskatchewan.. . . . .	69,000
British Columbia.. . . . .	296,851
Alberta.. . . . .	Nil

I have before me sessional paper No. 192B, being a return showing how much the federal government contributed to each of the provinces, last year and in the current year, in the form of cooperative public works and enterprises, to assist in the relief of unemployment. The figures are as follows:

Yukon.. . . . .	\$ 20,000
Northwest Territories.. . . . .	37,500
British Columbia.. . . . .	251,000
Saskatchewan.. . . . .	57,300
Manitoba.. . . . .	270,000
Ontario.. . . . .	345,700
Quebec.. . . . .	345,000
Nova Scotia.. . . . .	25,000
Alberta.. . . . .	Nil

Mr. DUNNING: Would my hon. friend say that that is discrimination?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The minister may be correct in saying that it is not