

explanation as to what this committee is for. Certainly, as the section now stands, it cannot be said that parliament has made any provision whatever for this committee to function. It will be composed of many classes of people, representative of all the various organizations in the country, industrial, occupational, philanthropic and social service organizations, and it is to include labour, the minister says. There are three labour organizations we know of, and he has not yet dealt with more than one phase. He has not dealt with social service organizations. The minister did name women's institutes—

Mr. ROGERS: Just by way of illustration.

Mr. BENNETT: And he said that there would be a member from one of these organizations.

Mr. ROGERS: It was not exhaustive at all.

Mr. BENNETT: No, not exhaustive at all; that is my point. We found it essential to fix the number in connection with the advisory committee to the wheat board. The select committee agreed upon that, and it was not a committee of one party in the house. While I do not suggest to the minister that it is entirely necessary that he should limit the number, I do point out that if he does not, he is going to find himself confronted with a serious situation at the very threshold of his efforts—I do not think he intends this to be so—having regard to the fact that the language he uses indicates that the commission will not obtain the maximum of its efficiency without this committee. The committee comes into being to enable the commission more effectively to discharge its functions. I do not think it is fair to the minister himself, or to what he has in mind, or to what the government has in mind to leave the section as it is; and remember, in view of the succeeding sections this committee may involve this country in enormous expenditures because there is no indication that the committee must meet at any particular place. They can meet any place, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Vancouver or anywhere else. I only point out that if this is intended to be a real, vital, living part of this measure, certainly additional provision should be made to that which appears in the bill itself.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Women's employment committee.

Miss MACPHAIL: As I listened to the discussion of this bill section by section, I wondered why we needed it at all. Cannot

the government set up a commission and give it wide terms of reference without having to bring down a bill? It has really got to the point of being almost ridiculous, the number of things that have been provided for by the bill. I am sure any party that attains power would be much more comfortable if they could burn all their election literature that helped them into office. I think of the enormous number of posters I saw in my constituency last October, which said, "Vote Liberal and get action." It sounds amusing in the light of this bill. They should have read, "Vote Liberal and get advice."

An hon. MEMBER: After six months.

Miss MACPHAIL: Yes, after six months. And then there was that other beautiful slogan, "King or chaos." We had better change the "or" to "and," because this bill looks to me like chaos, and by the time they get through it will be "King and chaos." I do not think a bill was needed at all for this purpose. We have had plenty of bills and are not in need of any more. That is not the great need of this country. The great need is to do something about unemployment. Why could not the Department of Labour have started on this problem immediately after the election? I do not remember any other royal commission having to be set up by means of a bill introduced in parliament, and considered in committee section by section. But if there had to be a bill, certainly this section nine is necessary, and it should be in. It provides for a women's employment committee. The unemployed women have scarcely been mentioned in this house and very little has been done to take care of them. We have camps for the young single destitute men, but one wonders where the single destitute women are. For wherever they are, and whatever their lives, the parliament of Canada must certainly bear some responsibility.

I think it was the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Wermentinger) who referred to the increasing fear of idleness. I do not think anyone is worrying very much about idleness, provided the people who are idle have enough to live on. It is the wherewithal to make a comfortable living that is the great need, and not work. I think we have gone as far as we can go with this stressing of work. If we go on another twenty-five or thirty years with machines displacing men and women as they have been, everyone will recognize that there cannot be work for all. Work is not the main worry of these people; it is having something in their pockets to enable them to get food, clothing and shelter and