

be giving powers to the government to deal by way of order in council with matters pertaining to the peace, order and good government of the country; that we would also be giving to the government a blank cheque during a time when parliament was in session, and that that would mean a subversion of the rights of parliament. I think the Prime Minister will recall that I stressed that side of the question. In order to meet my suggestion my right hon. friend changed the date from March 31 to March 1. As his reason for the change he said that it would avoid any question being raised of the subversion of the rights of parliament. In order that there may be no misunderstanding I will quote his words as they appear in Hansard of 1931 at page 4448:

I am not without full realization of what is involved in the bill, but in order to meet my right hon. friend I will shorten the time to March 1 and make it clear that we have no desire to usurp powers as was suggested.

What did my right hon. friend mean when he changed the date from March 31 to March 1 in order that there could be no question of a subversion of powers?

Mr. BENNETT: I take it, Mr. Chairman, that I am not here to be cross-examined. I have no observation to make at all as to what took place last session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As leader of the opposition may I say I am here to discover what value is to be attached to the word of the Prime Minister. Last year the Prime Minister of Canada gave to this parliament a solemn pronouncement in the words which I have just read and which he now repudiates, and which for the most part has occasioned the debate which has taken place. Last year we accepted in good faith the word of my right hon. friend; we believed he meant what he said. We did not think he meant to deceive parliament when this year came round.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We believed he meant that on March 1 the act would expire, that parliament would be in session, and that no effort would be made to extend its provisions while parliament was in session. It was because of the promise which at that time my right hon. friend gave to the opposition that we then ceased to press our opposition to the measure. I ask: what guarantee have we that the change in date now being made has any significance whatever? Can the Prime Minister's word be relied upon?

Mr. BAKER: Always.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is an instance where it cannot be relied upon. I wish to repeat that I have asked the Prime Minister what he meant when he gave his word to parliament.

Mr. BAKER: He always means and makes good what he says.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I regret very much that as leader of the opposition I have to say to the Prime Minister of Canada that he has broken faith with parliament—

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —that he has not kept his word, and that from now on we will be unable to accept his word in regard to any public measure.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hanson, York-Sunbury): Shall the resolution as amended carry?

Mr. RALSTON: No, Mr. Chairman. I desire to ask the right hon. Prime Minister by whom the returns are made which are summarized on page III of the Report of the Dominion Director of Unemployment Relief.

Mr. BENNETT: I have not the report beside me. But if the figures are those to which I think the hon. gentleman refers, they are sent forward by the provincial governments to the federal government, if the expenditure is partly discharged by the municipalities, partly by the provinces and partly by the dominion. If the expenditure is made directly by the federal government for public works or matters of that sort, the ordinary vouchers are provided through the Auditor General's department and are purely matters of federal administration. I think that is a correct statement of the position as far as I know.

Mr. RALSTON: I had before me a very recent number of the Labour Gazette which purported to show the number of man-days employment provided under the provisions of this act as being something over 7,000,000. I notice that this report shows less than 7,000,000. I want to find out how the discrepancy occurs and whether those returns were made up by the Department of Labour on a basis different from the basis employed by the Dominion Director of Unemployment Relief, who, I understand, is an officer of the Department of Labour.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. gentleman perhaps knows that an effort was made to bring the report down to date. But he will find there is no discrepancy between those figures

W.L. Mackenzie King Papers

Memoranda & Notes

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA