

Game Export Act

to what might be the cost if his department conducted the audit?

Mr. Chevrier: No, I have not.

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): Could that information be procured?

Mr. Chevrier: While I have not made that inquiry I remember a discussion which took place some two years ago, and I recall that if the Auditor General were to have a similar group of people doing this sort of work he could not do it for a smaller amount, particularly when one has in mind the fact that much of the work has to be done in the United States.

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): I am sure this very reputable firm would do a first class job. I do not object to their doing it, but I just wondered what a comparable cost would be.

Mr. Case: Is any part of the auditors' report reviewed or commented upon or passed upon by the Auditor General, under the present set-up? I presume some reference would be made to the Auditor General, particularly if advances were made by the government to the railway company. I was curious as to whether there is any direct reference to the Auditor General of the auditors' report.

Mr. Chevrier: The answer to the question is no, because in 1936 parliament provided the method of audit of the books of the Canadian National Railways. That is in section 13 of the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act.

Mr. MacNicol: In private business—and I am now referring to large firms such as that with which I was associated for many years—very often the auditors advise the officials of the company where this or that could be done better, where this or that could be cut out, or where this or that amount of money could be saved. In the case of the government, the Auditor General in his report recommends what should or should not be done, and I think our dominion Auditor General is doing a very fine job. Do these auditors make recommendations to the railway officials on where they may be overstepping the mark here or wasting money there? Are they doing a job such as is done by the auditors who look after private firms?

Mr. Chevrier: Yes, very definitely. In their report to parliament, which I tabled this week and which has been referred to the committee on railways and shipping, they do review the operations of the railway over the years and make certain recommendations,

some of which are accepted and some of which are not accepted but many of which are extremely useful in the operation of the Canadian National system.

Section agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHEESE

AMENDMENT OF CHEESE AND CHEESE FACTORY IMPROVEMENT ACT, AS TO PREMIUMS, ETC.

Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 16 to amend the Cheese and Cheese Factory Improvement Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

GAME EXPORT ACT

AMENDMENT AS TO ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS—
OATH OF OFFICE TAKEN BY GAME OFFICERS

Hon. J. A. MacKinnon (Minister of Mines and Resources) moved the second reading of Bill No. 14, to amend the Game Export Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Golding in the chair.

On section 1—"Game officer."

Mr. Knowles: Will the minister explain the bill?

Mr. MacKinnon: Mr. Chairman, as the Game Export Act was originally drafted, it was contemplated that dominion game officers would be specially appointed under this act. Authority for such appointments was not, however, retained in the bill as enacted and there are no officers so appointed. Our policy is to procure the enforcement of the act by game officers appointed under the game laws of the provinces, by provincial police and by members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and customs officers, all of whom are given adequate authority *ex officio* by section 6.

In these circumstances the reference in section 2 (c) to persons "appointed to enforce the provisions of this act" should be deleted; and a special form of oath of office is unnecessary. Further, the wording of section 5 (2) has caused some confusion as to the territorial extent of the powers of officers who have authority under section 6 to enforce this act. The 1948 conference of provincial and dominion wildlife officials adopted a