

suggest that there should be at least an order in council authorizing the employment of any such assistants. I say that in the light of my own painful experience. I believe there is an abuse of the authority conferred and—I do not make this statement as a reflection upon the government—sometimes these jobs have a habit of lasting a very long time, once begun. I say the government should exercise control, and say “No; we are not going to spend \$25,000 for this particular purpose. We are not getting balance sheets ready. What we are investigating is whether or not there is cause for criminal investigation.”

For instance, I would direct the minister's attention to the Nash fruit case; from that he will get an idea of what I mean. The investigation took place before the late government took office. He will find the same thing in connection with the price spreads commission, and in connection with one other commission. I have thought, and still think, that the amount of public money expended in this way was out of all proportion to what was necessary. A trial is not involved. The enormous sums of money spent in this way were brought to our attention before we went out of office. I think it would be desirable to have the governor in council exercise control before such expenditures are incurred.

Mr. KINLEY: Does the right hon. gentleman not think that the preliminary inquiry is a great protection for industry, and that in order to have a complete preliminary inquiry there should be complete investigation before publicity is given and before possibly irreparable harm is done?

Mr. BENNETT: But the preliminary investigation takes place after the investigation we are now considering. From a legal standpoint, the preliminary investigation takes place after this one, which is a departmental inquiry as to whether or not there is a *prima facie* case made out. Then complaint is made, the attorney general takes proceedings, there is a prolonged investigation, and the matter is sent on for trial.

Mr. KINLEY: It all contributes to the decision as to whether or not the minister and commissioner will hold a public inquiry?

Mr. BENNETT: It may be part public and part private, or both.

Mr. KINLEY: But the committee can see that premature public inquiry into a business may do harm. A special commissioner looks into the matter first; the preliminary inquiry comes next, and the minister and the commissioner may decide that it is not necessary to have a public inquiry. I believe in order

to have a complete preliminary inquiry it is necessary beforehand to have all possible evidence.

Mr. BENNETT: That part of it has been settled. The question now is as to whether or not the commissioner shall employ costly help, with or without the consent of the governor in council.

Mr. KINLEY: The word “costly” is assumed; it is not used in the section.

Mr. BENNETT: I use that word in the light of experience. I do not like to move amendments, because they are not received with great favour, but I do suggest that the section should read: “with the approval of the governor in council” instead of “with the approval of the minister.” I make that suggestion out of my own experience.

Mr. ROGERS: I am agreeable to that suggestion. I believe section 11 does bear on the same point, but applies only to remuneration.

Mr. ESLING: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there should be a more direct way of bringing these matters to the attention of the department. Reference has been made to radios. This is one case where it does not need any stretch of the imagination to know that a monopoly exists. No one can manufacture radios in Canada without first obtaining the consent of Radio Patents Limited, which is a holding company controlling every patent which enters into the construction of a radio. I suggest that the Department of Labour and the Department of National Revenue take steps to give the general public more intimate information in connection with the conditions surrounding the control of these patents. The Minister of National Revenue is probably aware that the difference in price in the United States and Canada for exactly the same radio is about 100 per cent. That difference against Canada is caused solely by the control of the patents. It is not as though the manufacturer had to deal with only one patentee; he must deal with this holding company which controls every patent.

I have a complaint from a man who purchased a radio in the United States for \$35, which he said would have cost him \$80 in Canada. He brought it back under the \$100 exemption clause, declared it and received a clearance. Shortly after, he was served with a notice that he was infringing certain patent rights by reason of the fact that he had brought the radio in from the United States, and he was called upon to pay a royalty. It is such incidents as this that cause discontent. I think the government would go far towards