

thing. I frequently notice in the British Parliamentary reports, debates respecting the acts of the censor. I cannot give any concrete case, but on many occasions I know that specific acts of the censor have been discussed in the British Parliament.

Mr. EDWARDS: The hon. member for Halifax persists in misstating my point of order, and I say that advisedly, because he must have understood what I said. My point is not that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has no right to discuss the acts of the censor, but that he has no right to quote from a book the circulation of which has been prohibited under heavy penalties in this country, thereby circulating through the medium of Hansard the very material which the censor has declared must not be circulated.

Mr. SPEAKER (having taken the Chair): I am taken somewhat at a disadvantage in not having been able to follow the discussion from an earlier stage. As I understand it, on the motion to go into Supply the hon. member for Edmonton rose with a view to discussing a publication called "The Fiddlers." In my judgment it is not competent for an Order in Council to override the authority of Parliament, and it seems to me that it is peculiarly a matter for Parliament to determine what shall be done as to the discussion on a given matter in a given case. With the facts I have before me, I do not think the point of order raised by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) is well taken.

Mr. OLIVER: I desired to read only a short extract from the book to show that it was not of the character it was represented to be by the report of Surgeon General Fotheringham. It is a criticism of the policy of the Government of Great Britain in regard to a matter of serious importance, and not a criticism in any degree of the conduct of our troops in England. I will read just a short extract from page 4, under the heading, "The Shadow of Famine":

"We have to face this grim menace," says Lord Davenport. "We are taking no chances," says the Prime Minister, and the nation will hope there is some meaning in the words. It is the tragic irony of this solemn time that so many men in high places have talked like kings and ruled like jesters.

The nation looks to Mr. Lloyd George to be equal to his words.

The Prime Minister blames the late Government that let slip the greatest opportunity in British history, for helping famine on; but it will not do. The new Government has been bringing famine nearer every day; it has allowed the destruction of enormous quantities

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

of food, and those who are guilty of this crime have no stones to throw at others. The Prime Minister came into office with the food shortage in sight; it was his first duty to build up the great reserve of food we might have had now in our granaries if the drink trade had not destroyed it. We could have laughed at submarines, for our barns would have been filled to overflowing, and we could have lived in comfort for a year if no ship reached us.

Let us see how much food drink has destroyed since the war began. We will take it from August 4, 1914, to April 30, 1917. It is 999 days of the war. The quantity of grain and sugar destroyed for drink has been:

	Tons.
Grain for bread	4,400,000
Sugar for beer	340,000

It is not easy to realize what this means, but it will help us if we think of one or two examples.

The biggest thing ever set up on earth is the great Pyramid. It is 80,000,000 cubic feet. The food destroyed by drink during the war would make two great pyramids, both bigger than the pyramid of Egypt.

The longest British railway is the Great Western. It is over 3,000 miles, but it would not hold the food destroyed by drink since the war began. If every inch of it were crammed with wagons, the Great Western railway would need hundreds of miles more line to hold the train loads of food destroyed.

So vast is this incredible quantity of food destroyed by an enemy trade while famine has been coming on. We should have saved it all if Parliament had followed the King, and it would have given the whole United Kingdom its flour rations for nearly a year.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. SPEAKER: I see myself that there is a quorum present. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. OLIVER:

Take it at its minimum scientific food value, and on the basis of our rations in April, 1917, it would have given us:

	Weeks.
Flour for the whole United Kingdom . . .	43
Sugar for the whole United Kingdom . . .	33

Our three war Governments, confronted with the increasing certainty of at least a three years' war, have allowed the drink trade to destroy this vast reserve of food. It will not do for Mr. Lloyd George to blame his predecessors. He has carried on their policy of food destruction. In the first four months of 1917 he has allowed the destruction of 400,000 tons of grain to bolster up this trade in drink. It would give the United Kingdom its bread rations for thirty days; it would make all the difference till the harvest is over.

Another paragraph, page 15, reads as follows:

And now we have a new idea from the Food Control Department; it is a coloured poster of a Union Jack and a big loaf on it and "Waste not, want not," printed in big type. It was being printed on the day the Prime Minister