

was made for the secretary, and I desired to point out that as the minister has not made provision for salary he has no power to fix salary, and has merely power of appointment. It would be taken to be an honorary position, under that circumstance.

There is the further statement that the section now before the committee does not provide for the payment of officers. In the Tariff Board Act—and I well recall the circumstances now, when my attention is directed to it—subsection 5 of section 7 provided:

(5) There shall be employed in the service of the board such officers, clerks and other employees as the board with the approval of the governor in council may see fit to appoint, and they shall respectively receive such salaries or remuneration as may be approved by the governor in council upon the recommendation of the board.

That is in the Tariff Board Act, chapter 55 of the statutes for 1931. So much for that phase of the matter.

I merely pointed out the desirability, in my judgment, since provision has been made for salaries for the board, that equally provision should be made for the payment of salaries to the secretary and officers, or others who may be employed.

The second point to which I wish to direct attention is concerning an observation of the Prime Minister as to the paucity of information furnished by the last Minister of Labour in the late administration. Whatever faults may have been found with the Minister of Labour in the former administration there is this to be said, that complete information as to the operation of all relief acts has been furnished not only to the House of Commons but in the printed forms for which I have sent, and which I now hold in my hand. The first is a report in regard to the Unemployment Relief Act of 1930, the second a report in regard to the Unemployment Relief Act of 1931, and then reports in regard to the acts of 1932, 1933, and 1934, all of which reports were made during the days of the late administration. I have forgotten to look for the report regarding the 1935 act. My recollection is that it was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS: It will be tabled in a few days.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, it will be; I was wrong about that. The report for 1934 was prepared by the director, Mr. Hereford, and the form in which he presented the figures is the form which has been used ever since the beginning of the relief acts. These reports contain all the details, except two, furnished by the minister the other day. Possibly that is a little too strong; perhaps it should

be one and a half. They contain all the figures with respect to relief expenditures. These are classified in the annual reports. And in another sense the report of the Department of National Defence to the minister did contain a statement of the average length of time that single, unemployed men lived in the relief camps. But of course it was not brought down to date, as it was one day last week by the minister himself.

Therefore these reports contain the very information which the house has had placed before it in condensed form by the Minister of Labour. Perhaps it would be proper and right to say that he brought the information up to date, which obviously the report could not have done, because the operations of the act ceased on March 31, and a report could not be laid on the table until a suitable period had elapsed, so as to enable information to be collated, printed and published for the use of the house. I do not think any more complete information as to the operation of any series of statutes has ever been laid before parliament than that contained in these reports of the successive Ministers of Labour. The reports start with the act of 1930, and I am told by the minister that in a few days the report on the operations of the act of 1935 will be laid before the house. They contain not only details as to the number of people receiving relief, but also in detail a statement of the expenditures made from time to time, and an indication of how they were made in each of the several provinces of the confederation. The particulars are set out at length, and it will be recalled that in some circumstances they go into more detail. I will not do more than direct the attention of the committee to that point at this time.

The next point to which I direct the attention of the committee is one arising out of a statement made by the Prime Minister that the administration of the act, and the expenditures under that administration, were little short of a scandal; and he used the word "scandal." If I turn to the last report, namely, that of the operations of The Relief Act, 1934, at page 7, these words will be found:

By order of the governor in council of September 30, 1932 (P.C. 2163), the auditor general was authorized to conduct such audits of provincial accounts in connection with unemployment relief expenditures as he deemed essential to safeguard the interests of the federal treasury, and to investigate the provincial systems of auditing municipal relief accounts to the end that the dominion government might be satisfied that the municipal accounts put forward by the provinces were in accordance with the agreements entered into between the dominion government and the provinces.