

are unable to work and are in need should be provided for adequately. Work should be found or made for all able-bodied workers who, without it, would be in need of the necessities of life, and reasonable means should be adopted to increase the earning power of those who are relatively inefficient.

The Victorian era built up assets for the future, but those assets have been squandered through a mad spending period in the last forty years. The modern politician seems to think it necessary to extend parliamentary interference to every phase of life, business, commerce, imports and exports and everything from Dan to Beersheba, in the form of useless commissions, with the result that we are over-governed. In the early days there were no bankrupt municipalities; to-day there are 247 and they are all crying out for some assistance and receiving none. The solution of the unemployment problem should be found in this house and not in any commission. A committee of this house should be set up to study the whole question, just as we have a committee on so important a subject as railways and shipping. The solution calls for national sacrifice and not for parliamentary repartee. The government of the day must be a constructive force whose object should be the building up of a healthy society; otherwise there is a danger of the people turning to socialism. In sound progressive measures lies the hope of the country. Such a policy may be unpopular in parliament, but if the fight is carried outside we shall find that the rules will be broken, for the man in the street has grown weary. He is of the opinion that the government is dealing with the unemployment question with the object of preserving its own existence and not for the good of the people as a whole, and that its attempts at reform are only half-hearted. The domestic policy has failed, for the stock in trade of the government seems to be summed up in the struggle of the ins and the outs.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE PERLEY (Argenteuil): I should like to call the Prime Minister's attention again to section 5. It seems to me it would make for better legislation if this section were enacted in a separate bill. The rest of the bill has to do entirely with the Department of Labour, but the administration of section 5 will be carried out through the Department of Finance and the minister of that department will advise the governor in council in regard thereto. Section 5 is for an indefinite time, being more or less permanent, or effective until it is repealed by parliament; whereas the remainder of the

[Mr. Church.]

act expires on March 31, 1937. In my opinion this bill should cover only the matters which are definitely to expire on March 31, 1937, and as I say it would be better if section 5 were put in a separate bill, which would then be lawfully in force until repealed by parliament. However, that is a matter entirely for the government, and if in their judgment it is all right, if they wish it to stand, I have nothing more to say.

In order to be helpful if I can, may I remind the house that an amendment was proposed to section 2, suggested I think by my leader but accepted by the government, that at the end of clause 2, after the word "labour" there should be added the words, "and whenever used in this act the word 'minister' shall mean the Minister of Labour." I believe that was agreed to by the committee, but it does not appear in the reprint of the bill which I have before me.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I thank my right hon. friend (Sir George Perley) for his words which, as usual, are intended to be and are helpful. To take the last point first, I think the reprint of the bill which my right hon. friend has is the reprint issued the day before yesterday, and which therefore does not contain the amendments made yesterday. The amendment my right hon. friend has referred to as having had its origin at the instance of the right hon. leader of the opposition was adopted by the committee yesterday and will appear in the bill as it finally passes.

As to the other point I may say to my right hon. friend that while the government naturally hopes that it will not be necessary to renew this legislation, or at least all of its clauses, for another year at the expiration of the present fiscal year, it may be necessary to do so. In that event, of course, we will do as my right hon. friend's friends did when they were in office; we shall ask parliament, before the expiration of this fiscal year, to renew the bill for a further period of time. In those circumstances I think the point raised by the right hon. gentleman, as to the possible effect of other clauses expiring at the end of the fiscal year, will not effect what he has in mind. I may say this, that should it not be necessary to renew the bill undoubtedly section 5 will have to be renewed in the form of a separate bill, and that will be done. This is all part of the law of the land meanwhile, and as the committee considered that point when the bill was before it I think we might allow the bill to receive third reading as it stands.