

## UNEMPLOYMENT

ASSISTANCE FOR AGRICULTURAL SETTLEMENT AND  
REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF  
NATURAL AND OTHER RESOURCES

Hon. NORMAN McL. ROGERS (Minister of Labour) moved the third reading of Bill No. 19, to assist in the relief of unemployment, the promoting of agricultural settlement and rehabilitation, and in the development, conservation and improvement of certain natural and other resources.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, before the bill receives third reading I should like to detain the house for only a very few moments. By standing order 38 the motion for third reading is debatable, and I am thereby permitted to speak.

At the outset may I say that I am greatly disappointed in the bill. In the first place, the title of the bill is not correct but, as I said on Monday, it may be changed in another place. In the second place, the bill does not give the employment commission in making agreements with the provinces, corporations and individuals the powers they should have. The functions of the employment commission which will carry out the terms of this bill and the preceding one are purely advisory. Time and again we find in the bills that they are "to advise and report" or "to report and advise." What are the unemployed going to do while all this advising is going on? The government has admitted that no concrete or definite plan by the commission can be secured for almost a year. In other words, we shall have to wait another year before any concrete developments or definite plans will be proposed. Then, when they are proposed, what will happen? The commission will report and advise the minister who, in turn, may reject their advice, the same as he may reject the advice of the officials of his own department.

I was pleased yesterday to note the showing of independence of three of the one hundred and seventy members of the party in office. There seemed to be an awakening as to what is going on, as to what people are saying, because we know that Ottawa never knows what the rest of the country is thinking. Those who are new members will have a rude awakening from their constituents. I say that they are elected here to function as members of parliament, and not to always sit still and do the bidding of their party or leader, or of the government or any other group. They are free citizens under a free constitution. Look at the way private government members

in the old land criticize even government bills dealing with social matters and unemployment, and that sort of thing. Perhaps if in this house we had a measure for the relief of unemployment such as was introduced in England conditions might be different. We know that Great Britain is recovering faster than any other country, and its recovery is being brought about because the British people have attacked this great social disease in the practical and the 1936 way. Instead of a commission cure, a cure which will never amount to anything, they have adopted other means. Commissions have never cured anything in Canada since we have been a country. Hon. members have been elected as a commission of 245 members to deal with the problem, but we sit here day in and day out and do nothing about it.

With all due respect may I say that the government is one of conscientious Canadians, but I must add that the house must not be asked to pass Bill No. 19 without knowing the names of all the members of this seven-fold amen, this last word, so to speak, of the government commission on unemployment. We know who one of them is, Mr. Purvis, already named in advance under the new triumph of the present government of separatism. We used to have the King, the Senate and the House of Commons. Now announcements are made by order in council without reference to the sovereign or his representative in Canada. Before the bill is passed we should know how it will operate, because I believe there will be a conflict of law, and this Bill No. 19, with regard to its industries clauses, will wind up in the law courts. No doubt agreements with industries, individuals and corporations will be taken to court. Application for injunction can be made, because it is my opinion that parliament has no power to pass the bill now before us on account of the interference with property and civil rights in the provinces.

There are at present before the supreme court several bills—ten bills in all—dealing with subjects closely related to this new deal of 1935, and before this measure passes we should know what the Supreme Court of Canada has to say about such matters. No statement has been made about unemployment insurance, or the power of parliament to regulate trade and commerce which has been unregulated since confederation. That field is within the jurisdiction of parliament, and with the exception of some minor laws has been unexplored since confederation.

I for one do not propose to sacrifice my rights as a member of parliament. I know