

where the authority of one department begins and the authority of the other ends—there is nothing new about it. If this is to be determined, as it should be finally, then it should be done by statute and not otherwise. If it was done by order in council presumably the order in council would have been laid upon the table in order that we might understand and appreciate the extent to which reorganization had been carried out. I thought I had among my papers a typewritten statement of the duties of the two departments, but I do not seem to be able to lay my hand upon it. However, there will be ample opportunity to discuss the matter on another occasion.

The next matter that engages the attention of the house at the instance of the government has to do with the air service, about which we will hear more when the minister proceeds with his bill. According to the bill which appears upon the order paper we are about to enter upon an ambitious scheme of transacting air business outside of our own country.

Reference is made in the speech from the throne to the work of three commissions. One commission was appointed under the provisions of the Veterans' Assistance Commission Act, 1936; another was appointed to inquire into the textile industry, and then there is the national employment commission. The national employment commission has made a report to which apparently the chairman has given very careful attention. It might be a matter of inquiry as to why no steps are being taken to implement this report. If the commission was of the importance indicated, why has its report not been implemented? Why does the speech from the throne not indicate that it is proposed to do so? From the language of this document it would appear that the commission has concluded its labours and is now to go out of business.

I come now to the commission appointed to inquire into the textile industry. This commission was appointed two years ago, shortly after the present government came into office; we are now at the end of January, 1938, and the report of the commission has not yet been filed or tabled in the house. There was a tariff board to which this matter might have been referred. Those of us who have followed the language used by counsel who appeared on behalf of the government when attacking the industry and the officers of the industry wonder why one who was selected by the government to represent it on many occasions during the progress of the grain inquiry finds it not inconsistent with his sense of decency to become a director of the Dominion Textile Company.

[Mr. Bennett.]

Mr. DUNNING: That is quite wrong.

Mr. BENNETT: The press carried photographs of Mr. Ralston along with that announcement.

Mr. DUNNING: I am quite sure that my right hon. friend's statement is in error and that he would not want to do an injustice to any individual by making such a statement.

Mr. BENNETT: It was so stated in the Financial Post.

Mr. DUNNING: In addition, Colonel Ralston was not counsel on the textile inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT: I did not say that he was. I said he was counsel on the grain inquiry. I also said he had joined the directorate of the Dominion Textile Company; and in the Toronto Financial Post, as well as in the daily papers of Montreal, his photograph was published with the statement that he had joined that board.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my right hon. friend that I saw the report, or one of them, to which he refers, and asked Colonel Ralston if the report was true. Colonel Ralston said to me in reply that his name had been placed on the board of directors but that he had refused to accept an appointment.

Mr. BENNETT: I am very glad to hear that, for the simple reason that it seemed to me to be wholly inconsistent with the discharge of the duties of counsel to the government of this country on the grain inquiry for him to occupy such a position, when counsel for the dominion in the textile inquiry had denounced those companies in the terms in which he had. Those who followed the language used in the denunciation of the textile companies will understand exactly why I make that statement. I am very glad indeed to hear what the Prime Minister has said; I regret to say that I do not think it has attained much publicity, but I trust that this publicity will end any question that may arise in that regard.

But let us go a step further. Why has this matter dragged for two years? Why, when the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Howard) was so insistent with respect to an immediate inquiry—which was granted—has two years elapsed and no report been made? There was a tariff board, to which it was not referred; this special commission of one man was set up for the purpose of making the inquiry and side by side with that there was