

taught throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): While I was listening to the very eloquent address of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Paquet) thoughts were running through my mind of the different nationalities within the bounds of this magnificent Empire to which we belong. My hon. friend, in addressing the House, used the flowing sentences of his native tongue as a descendant of those whose home was on the beautiful plains and sunny hillsides of France. I who follow him am a descendant of those whose homes were in the rocky hills and glens of Scotland. I find that my hon. friend as a descendant of those who dwell in a foreign country is free to arise in this great court of the people representing a part of our splendid Empire and to address us in the tongue of his own people. It would appear to be a hardship that I, whose ancestors of a thousand years lived upon the Island of Great Britain itself am to speak to you in what was to my forefathers, and is to me, a foreign tongue. My native language is that of Wallace and of Bruce; I am a Gaelic-speaking man. However, I do not make any complaint, but I speak of this matter only as one characteristic of the magnificent Empire in which we live and a proof of the liberties we enjoy. With such use as I am able to make of this foreign language in which I am obliged to speak here, I shall endeavour to make a few observations on the subject before the Chair.

I was not able to follow the hon. member for L'Islet very closely, as I did not understand his arguments so clearly as he does himself, and therefore I cannot deal with his arguments in detail. I fully agree with him in what he says with respect to the policy of the Canadian people in the present war. I fully agree with him also in his denunciation of the German atrocities. I am not so sure that I agree with him in his praises of the financial policy of this Government, nor in his argument that the Royal commissions issued by this Government were fully justified and the money they cost well spent. That is what he said if I followed his argument correctly. Let me remind the hon. member—and I am sure he understands my words very well—that when he is dealing with these charges about Royal Commissions he knows, perhaps, but little about the extravagances attendant upon

them. This afternoon I pointed out some extravagances in connection with one commission. I showed that it cost about \$128 to pay for one afternoon's service of one gentleman when at most the charge should have been \$21 or \$22. I was told by no less an authority than the Minister of Customs that I should not make any such charge, because this gentleman was also engaged in serving subpoenas. Serving subpoenas, forsooth! What is the duty of serving subpoenas, and what is usually paid to those who serve them? In the part of the country from which I come, and where these subpoenas were served, there are constables whose duty it is to serve them. These constables receive the enormous sum of five cents a mile as mileage and 20 cents for each subpoena they serve. In this case, in which the minister tells us with a flourish of trumpets that subpoenas were served by this commissioner who received about \$20 a day, three witnesses were served. Had these subpoenas been served by the constable, he would have received sixty cents for serving the three with a mile for each, say three miles, so that the serving of the three subpoenas would have cost seventy-five cents. And we have a minister of the Crown standing up in this House, and with feigned indignation, striking his desk and saying that I should not find fault with an expenditure of about \$108 more than there ought to be because, forsooth, the commissioner must serve subpoenas. And the hon. member for L'Islet is defending conduct of that kind. He says that this is all right; that under this Government we must abandon the machinery for serving papers that exists in the municipalities and must pay a man \$15 a day and also pay him for six dinners, six horse-hires, six times whatever his itemized bill may be.

Mr. PAQUET: I did not say that.

Mr. McKENZIE: I assure my hon. friend that that is what I understood him to say. However, he understands his words better than I do, and I will not cross swords with him on that subject. I will turn aside from his speech, simply congratulate him on the excellent manner in which he presented his views, and go on to say what I had laid out for myself.

Mr. Speaker, let me first direct your attention and that of the House to the attitude we on this side take towards the question that is uppermost in the mind of every man in this country at the present hour. I myself am getting to that stage