

tion of Parliament that the time has come when a halt should be called to further proceedings of this kind by the Government. I repeat that I hope the minister will have some explanation to give to the House when the Bill gets into committee. I would just draw the attention of the House and the country to the fact that here is one more of the many instances that have been quoted this session, first, where legislation passed by Parliament has been absolutely ignored and the Government has taken action entirely beyond the scope of that legislation and, second, where moneys appropriated for a particular purpose have been used by the Governor in Council for an entirely different purpose notwithstanding that Parliament has placed a restriction upon the amount of public money which should be spent in a particular direction.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—definition:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not able, having moved the second reading, to reply to the leader of the Opposition. I should not let the occasion pass without saying something about his solicitude for the Government. His great care is that we do not exceed the legal bounds of our authority. I did not have my attention drawn to the Orders in Council he read to the House, or the portions which he read, but just sitting and listening to them and looking at the Act itself, I was not struck by any conflict between the terms of the Order in Council and the wording of the Act. Nor do I see any reason at all to believe that the terms of the order in the least degree exceed the powers given to the Governor in Council by the Act. Referring to the first one, if I got it rightly—I would be glad indeed to have the copy sent across—it provided that, by means of regulation, the Minister of Labour might grant assistance to the support of an employment office in cases where the office and, I think, the help were provided by the municipality. The Order in Council says:

The Minister of Labour may establish and maintain offices at such points as he may deem necessary, provided the municipality supply office space and equipment required.

Now section three of the Act reads as follows:

The minister is authorized and empowered,—

(a) to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices and to promote uniformity of methods among them;

(b) to establish one or more clearing houses for the interchange of information between em-

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

ployment offices concerning the transfer of labour and other matters;

(c) to compile and distribute information received from employment offices and from other sources, regarding prevailing conditions of employment.

Now by section 10 the minister may make any regulations, not inconsistent with the Act, which he may deem necessary to carry this Act into effect, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. That is to say the Governor in Council may make regulations. Consequently the Governor in Council may make regulations to aid in the organization and co-ordination of employment offices. Now the Governor in Council in pursuance of that does what? It passes a regulation that the minister may establish and maintain offices at such points as he may deem necessary—really the same meaning as the first clause—provided the municipality grants the office space and equipment required. Where does that exceed the bounds of clause (a) defining what the minister is empowered to do? The following clauses provide that the minister may as well, from a special appropriation provided by the Act, pay certain moneys to the provinces according to a certain rule and proportion. That is one power. Clause three contains another power that the minister evidently acted upon. There appears to be another Order in Council of the 18th December, 1918. The second Order in Council to which the leader of the Opposition refers contains a provision appropriating:

\$30,000 from the War Appropriation for the purpose of making subventions to various provinces on the basis stated, the said sum of \$30,000 being over and above the appropriation of \$50,000 named in the statute.

The statute was one providing an appropriation for certain well-defined purposes. It has no special relation to soldiers' demobilization or to the war at all—it is permanent in its character. This appropriation, which evidently came in March, 1919, the very time when most of the men were returning, was an appropriation designed to take care especially of returned men and to make special efforts under the provision of the Act, and also under the powers given the Governor in Council under the terms of the War Appropriation Act itself, to place returned men in suitable employment as soon as possible. I have not under my hand the terms of the War Appropriation Act, but I have not the faintest doubt that the Governor in Council was clearly authorized by Parliament to make an appropriation just for