

months' imprisonment and 5,000 francs fine for speculation in boots and shoes.

Then to-day I read in the Montreal Gazette the following:

Profiteering Charge.

Grand Jury's Bill Against American Woollen Co.

New York, May 26.—The American Woollen Company was charged with profiteering in an indictment returned here late to-day by the federal grand jury, with the American Woollen Company of Boston and William M. Wood, president of both companies. The indictment, charging violation of the Lever Act, contained 12 counts, alleging that the company had sold cloth at unreasonable and unjust rates. One count charges that on January 2 the company sold 74½ yards of material that cost \$1.62 a yard for \$3.25 and that on January 19, 85½ yards that cost \$1.90 was sold for \$3.90.

Many examples of profiteering were given when the Board of Commerce held its sittings in Ottawa last year, and the offenders should have met with just such punishment as was meted out in the cases I have cited.

When I urge the Government to tax people who have made big money and got rich quick through the war, I think I am supported by sane people everywhere. This is what a French newspaper, *L'Echo de Paris*, of April 21, 1920, says on this subject:

THE WAR CONTRACTS TO BE REVISED.

A maximum profit of 10 per cent to be Allowed.

The Government is soon to bring down a bill countersigned by Mr. Lhopiteau, keeper of the seals, and Mr. François Marsal, minister of Finance, by which shall be instituted a relief tax upon the war contracts with the State, the departments, the communes and public establishments.

The amount of the tax is calculated so as to leave to the purveyors and the middlemen, after deduction of charges of all sorts, a maximum profit of 10 per cent for the former and, for the latter, of 2 per cent or even of ½ per cent, according to the importance of the contract.

The tax will be collected through the process in use in the matter of direct taxation.

The examination of the contracts and the assessment of the tax to be collected are the work of a district commission, the members of which are chosen by reason of their fiscal, industrial, commercial or agricultural qualifications.

The decisions of the commission are not subject to appeal.

Appeal to the State council is allowed only in case of violation of the law or abuse of power.

That is what the countries of Europe and the United States are doing, and it is what this Government ought to have done, but which we find to our great regret it has not done.

The Minister of Finance in the course of his remarks also stated that he has stopped borrowing. Well, we might congratulate him on that, but he cannot take all the credit for it, because if he has stopped borrowing, it is for the good reason that there is no more money to borrow. The people have given just as much as they could, and I do not think the Government could float another popular loan to-day.

The Minister of Finance also said that the road of the administration had been made very hard for him to travel on account of sectional differences and the lack of unity in this country. He said that if there was such unity of sentiment and feeling as prevailed during the war it would be a very easy task for him to put the finances of this country in proper shape. I would ask him how he expects there can be unity of feeling throughout this country when the additional taxes he is imposing to-day are going to bear more heavily on certain classes of the community than on others? How can he expect unity when the people of this country find out that those who ought to have been made to pay are exempt under this Budget, and that the so-called luxury tax affects the working classes and those less able to bear it more than any others? Let me remind the hon. gentleman that if he wants to have unity in this country he must follow the traditions which have been handed down by our ancestors in years past. He must follow the traditions of Baldwin, Lafontaine, Laurier and others who preceded us, and fill vacancies in important posts in different parts of the country in accordance with tradition. When the President of the Harbour Commission in the District of Quebec resigns a man of the same nationality should be appointed to replace him. He should also see, when there is a vacancy on the International Joint Waterways Commission which had been filled for years past by a Frenchman from the province of Quebec, that tradition should be followed in filling that vacancy, so that unity of sentiment might exist throughout the country. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he wants to promote unity of feeling and sentiment in this country he should try to put into practice the admirable words uttered by no less an authority than His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, in Montreal, last October. That Royal personage pleaded for freedom of speech and mutual respect between different peoples for the feelings of each other. It was only by recognizing the