

*Employment Commission*

Mr. BENNETT: That does not mean what the right hon. gentleman has said, an effective supervision of expenditures. Section 7 states just that, namely "shall, under the direction of the minister supervise the expenditure of funds." Those four words mean just the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, may I put it this way: in exercising the duties imposed upon the commission by section 7, the commission itself may discover that the means of supervision are not adequate and may therefore come to the conclusion that it is desirable to recommend to the government a more effective means of securing proper supervision.

Mr. BENNETT: Under section 7.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under section 7; when the commission has discharged the duties imposed upon it by section 7, namely of supervising the expenditures, it may find that the means of effecting the supervision are inadequate, and that if some further provision was made either by the municipalities, the provinces or the dominion for the supervision of expenditures it would be more effective, and consequently result in restricting waste, loss and fraud.

Section 6 simply gives the commission that power to recommend—"shall recommend to the minister effective means to secure when necessary an effective supervision and auditing of expenditures of all moneys."

Mr. BENNETT: If it is understood in that way I do not see any objection, except one which I shall put to the Prime Minister: Suppose that report is made; how can it be acted upon until parliament enacts legislation? Obviously this could be done only by parliamentary action. There is no power in the governor in council to give effect to that. There is no power intended by that, because we have our audit act. The auditor general could not have any additional power or additional authority put upon him, except by provision of statute.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite right, so far as federal powers are concerned. May I say to my right hon. friend I think perhaps he and some other members of the committee are wrong in assuming that the provinces and municipalities will resent every suggestion the commission makes. I believe it will be quite the opposite, and that they will welcome any commission which will help them to do those things for which the commission has been appointed.

Mr. CLARK (York-Sunbury): Has there been a change with respect to unemployables [Mr. J. F. Johnston.]

on direct relief? It has been understood in at least one municipality that unemployables are not included in the direct relief. Are they now, or have they been?

Mr. ROGERS: I did have a complete return showing the attitude taken towards unemployables in the various provinces, but I am sorry I have not that information before me just now. Broadly speaking, however, the situation is that in most but not all of the provinces unemployables who formerly were a direct charitable charge upon the municipalities and provinces have been shifted to the relief rolls and are not, except for purposes of classification—and that quite recently—distinguished from employables on relief. I am sorry that I have not the precise information before me respecting each province.

Mr. CLARK (York-Sunbury): What would be the division between unemployables and ordinary civic poor?

Mr. BENNETT: None, I should think.

Mr. ROGERS: My impression is that in New Brunswick the poor law regulations are still applied, but in other provinces we have a shifting of unemployables, who would normally be charitable charges in the municipalities, to relief rolls to which the dominion and the provinces now contribute.

Mr. POULIOT: With due respect to everybody, and particularly to the very able Minister of Labour, may I quote the views of two prominent men. First, Mr. Thomas Bradshaw of Toronto, president of the North American Life Insurance Company, has said that we are overlegislated. That is the view of a sensible business man. The other is the view of Mr. Pitblado, who was president of the Canadian Bar Association, who said that we must simplify the law. In my humble opinion these two gentlemen were right in that regard.

Mr. BENNETT: That makes it unanimous.

Mr. POULIOT: I offer a suggestion at this time. I do not desire to suggest an amendment, because I do not know whether I would have anybody to support it. It is troublesome enough to understand the language of the law, and it seems to me that when an amendment is made we should proceed with it in the same way as we proceed with notices of motion. I have before me the Votes and Proceedings for Friday, but the amendment of the minister does not appear. We have to look through Hansard; it is printed in different type, and we have all sorts of trouble to get it now. There is paragraph (c) which is amended. It is a rule of courtesy to submit