

*Trade Commission*

## TRADE AND INDUSTRY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Has the house finally considered the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 86? I understood a further conference was going on, and that we had not received the final report.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): My right hon. friend may be correct; I will ascertain the situation as quickly as possible. I believe so far as we in this house are concerned, however, the procedure is concluded.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We refuse to concur in three of the Senate amendments to that bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might go through the remaining supplementary and main estimates, reserving one of the readings.

Mr. BENNETT: The Senate have not concluded with Bill No. 86. I had a conference with them. It has not yet come back to the house but will be back presently. There are some supplementary estimates not yet disposed of.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we have concluded with everything except Bill No. 86 I see no reason why we might not go ahead with supply, and pass it in whole, but it is understood that there is to be no measure considered other than Bill No. 86. Is that it?

Mr. BENNETT: After we get the supply bill through, we want to vote on the Harris resolution because it was a vote the right hon. gentleman asked for, not a discussion.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Forget it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not want to repeat what the Right Hon. Mr. Thomas said, but I think it would be all humbug to have a vote on that resolution at this time.

Mr. BENNETT: It is on Hansard that the right hon. gentleman did not want to be prevented from the opportunity of voting on it. I want to give him the chance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will vote at once if my right hon. friend will guarantee there will be no discussion which will prolong the session.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, but somebody will have to make some observations to get the bill before the house. With respect to Bill No. 98 I am just advised that there is an effort to propose some amendments to that bill that we could not possibly accept as it would be a negation of all the effort we have made, but I cannot speak definitely until I see them.

[The Chairman.]

## SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Smith (Cumberland) in the chair.

To pay to the estate of the late General Sir Arthur William Currie, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., LL.D., in recognition of the eminent services rendered to his country by the deceased general during the great war, \$50,000.

Mr. BENNETT: I wonder if I might revert to the item making a grant to the estate of the late Sir Arthur Currie as I was not present when the item was discussed before, and I asked that it stand.

I should like to make it clear that the delay in bringing in this vote was quite anticipated by what was said by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) the other evening. It is a vote as we lawyers say, *nunc pro tunc*, a vote as if given to him in his lifetime, and is therefore payable to his estate, but it was not paid to the estate until such time as the estate was wound up. The complete estate consists of something around \$11,000, and this grant is being made as though it were being made to Sir Arthur Currie in his lifetime so far as that is possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is there a reasonable assurance that none of this money will be used for payments to any bank or anything of that sort?

Mr. BENNETT: It is that which I desired to make clear to the committee. I would not otherwise have mentioned it at all. The estate has been wound up and after the payment of all claims there is a small surplus of about \$11,000, so no part of this sum will become assessable for any claims of any character against the estate. That is my advice, and I also received a copy of the disposition of the winding up of the estate under the laws of Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): While I am not at all opposing this vote I think a life annuity would have been preferable in the public interest.

Mr. BENNETT: The reasons are obvious. The action taken is the action that should have been taken—shall I say, without being offensive to anyone—at the conclusion of the war. Those who have read the speech of Mr. Lloyd George when he proposed a grant of £100,000 to Lord Haig and £100,000 to Admiral Beatty, £25,000 to Sir Maurice Hankey and £50,000 to other generals and army commanders will remember that he pointed out at the beginning of his speech that it had always been the tradition in Great Britain that those who had rendered signal service to