

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: May I ask the right honourable gentleman a question? Does this not refer largely to Orders in Council?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think so. I do not want to be satirical. "It is proposed to restore to Parliament its control over taxation and expenditure by ending all measures" and so on. Orders in Council are not measures. Measures are bills or statutes. Orders in Council cannot be passed unless they are based upon and authorized by statutes. Unless they are so based and so authorized, no one need pay any attention to them; they are waste paper, fit only to burn. But measures are referred to here, and we are going to witness this session the ending of some measures. I am waiting anxiously for my distinguished friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) to tell me what measures these are, and just how they will be ended without being repealed. Is it that no new legislation will be introduced robbing Parliament of power? A Speech from the Throne does not usually foreshadow what will not be done; it tells us what will be done. This Speech tells us we are going to get rid of certain legislation which has robbed Parliament of certain powers. I want to know as soon as possible to what legislation I shall have to give my attention, because, as I apprehend the powers of Parliament and the facts of legislation, no legislation can possibly be passed that will ever rob Parliament of any power. How can Parliament rob itself?

Now, we are of course free from elections, and we ought to be tolerant to the prevalence of election ballyhoo of all kinds, but it does seem too bad that we should be asked to pass a vote of thanks for a Speech from the Throne which in these respects so manifestly insults our intelligence. Surely this nonsense should have been ended with the elections. If it got any votes and pleased any people to think we had autocracy in office overriding Parliament and the powers of Parliament—well, let it go at that. That is the way of some very often successful men. But why bring the matter up again when the elections are over and revive this ballyhoo of the past?

The honourable senator from Lethbridge dwelt for some time upon the subject of unemployment. There is a reference in the Speech from the Throne to unemployment, and a commission is promised to study this subject, supervise relief and co-operate with other governments, and generally to preside, as it were, over the meditations of the Canadian people in respect of unemployment. There are two other commissions promised in the Speech from the Throne. There is a

conference referred to, and there are some references to courts. But this special commission is to take into consideration the whole subject of unemployment. I have been a member of a Government for many years, and have been a witness of the conduct of administration for a longer period, and I have to admit before this House that I do not know of any adequate service a commission can perform in respect of this subject of unemployment and the administration of unemployment funds. I can understand a commission being created to perform a new and specific service which is determined upon as the expression of a new line of policy, but when there is no new line of policy I do not know how a commission which supervises the dispensation of funds, such as have been dispensed for the same purposes over a number of years past, can be of benefit to this country. It appears to me as a shifting of the burden of governmental work from the shoulders on which it was placed to other shoulders, for which the taxpayer will have to pay.

But, worse than that, the tendency of commissions whose main function is the distribution of governmental funds is to add to the amount of those funds and thus to the burden on the backs of the taxpayers, who have to provide the money. We have had many commissions in the past under both Governments. The ideas of commissions are concentrated on their own peculiar work. They like to see it well done, and usually elaborately done. Their minds do not get far beyond the sphere in which they are acting. They do not have to raise the money they are expending; it is handed to them. The onus of taxing to raise the money is not theirs, and that extreme care which is essential to prevent any of those great services getting out of hand entirely is far more likely to be exercised by a Minister of the Crown, under the eye of the Minister of Finance, than it is by a commission. If this peculiar commission is to reach dimensions foreshadowed in this Speech from the Throne, if it is to be as broadly representative as is indicated here, and is to act in co-operation with nearly everybody and every institution and all the provincial governments of our country, then what is to be the size of the commission? Besides, it is going to have some advisers. There is to be a board to advise the commission, which, I presume, will advise the Minister of Finance; and after the advising is all done the people's money will go out.

What is Parliament for? What are these two Houses of Parliament for but to study the