

ernment for this condition. I believe that the criticism made this afternoon by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) was justified when he said that we expected something more than we have received. That is one criticism I have to offer, and I must criticize further the unfulfilled pledges of this government. Worse than that however they turned about and adopted the very principle they then condemned, namely, relief through the provinces, and by the provinces to the municipalities. How they expect to escape criticism on that score is beyond me. True, they say that at this late date they have discovered it is impossible to act directly because they have not the jurisdiction. I call to their attention however that in some respects they have acted in a direct manner. Certainly the relief offered in the camps is an instance of direct action. In that connection relief has been granted through agencies in the provinces. I wish to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that these were not the policies propounded by the present government but are policies which were derided by them. They have found that when in office they have not been able to carry out their promises.

I am not going to take up the time of the house in a long discussion of these matters, but I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members the second important feature of this legislation, namely, the very wide powers sought by the government, despite the fact that they must deal through provincial agencies. What do they want? They want complete power—power to supersede statutes. They want to take unto themselves the only power which parliament has to control the executive. Why do they want this power? They say that in the past they have used it on only one occasion, namely, when Great Britain departed from the gold standard. But year after year they demand this power from the Canadian parliament so that they may have a free hand under the aegis of peace, order and good government to do as they please. They are allowed to do anything they wish under this measure.

I hold in my hand a record showing some of the things for which they have received a blank cheque, and under which they have proceeded to do business. Although I made reference to this point the other day, I shall refer to it again. I shall not take time more than to mention the guarantees to the provinces to assist them through difficult times, but I shall deal at greater length with the government's action in guaranteeing the banks for advances to the Beauharnois power project.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. McGIBBON: What about wheat?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Does the hon. member refer to the guarantee of the banks in connection with the so-called stabilization of the market?

Mr. McGIBBON: It was to help the western farmer; why differentiate?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): It is just as obnoxious to say that you delegate to the executive power to guarantee the purchase of wheat as it is to make advances to Beauharnois. It is exactly the same thing. I do not say parliament would have refused these powers, if it had been asked for them—not for a moment. I do not question that there would have been considerable discussion over the question of guaranteeing the banks with respect to advances to Beauharnois to complete construction but—

Mr. McGIBBON: Beauharnois did not originate here.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): No, but this government took it as its child.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Oh yes, it did. Some of these days I shall discuss the matter fully. Then, do you suppose that when a majority of this parliament delegated to their executive the right to make advances for relief purposes anybody had anticipated that they were going to guarantee the accounts of Newfoundland? I question very much if even my hon. friend who is perhaps just as strong a Conservative as I am a Liberal had any anticipation that this government were going to proceed to pledge the credit of Canada outside of this country altogether for the benefit of the sister dominion of Newfoundland. I know that my hon. friend will agree with the next guarantee that I name, that given in respect of the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation for the production of steel rails. I am not going to say very much about that except that if such a step had become necessary there was no reason in the world why the government could not have got their following in this house, even if the opposition had objected, to give this guarantee of one million odd dollars. The same thing applies to the advances in respect to the Algoma Steel Corporation and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Outside of the two steel companies there is not a tittle of evidence that these advances were for the purpose of giving employment. It is true that two million dollars was advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of providing employment, but there was no employment at all involved