

office the revenue of which does not exceed three thousand dollars per annum; but the preference provided by section twenty-nine of this act, in favour of the persons mentioned therein, shall be applied in respect of appointments to such positions.

I felt then that the minister would give serious consideration to that subject matter, and that when this bill was brought into the house we would find in it a similar provision. But I have looked for it in vain, there is no such provision. I again urge upon the minister that he include in this bill such a provision. At the same time, after the statement of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and after reading what the superintendent of penitentiaries thinks of private soldiers, one wonders whether there is any great value in retaining the preference in the act. I hope however, that this house and public opinion generally will be so unanimous in condemning what the hon. member for Quebec South so rightly characterized as an insult to the private soldiers of this country that General Ormond will not repeat the remarks he has made. I have no great hope, however, that he will prove a success in the position to which he has been appointed; my information is that he has not been successful in any of the other ventures over which he has had command. One has only to look back at the history of Rhyll at the close of the war to learn something of the capabilities of this gentleman. I consider that the remarks made by Brigadier-General Ormond are an example—

An hon. MEMBER: That statement about General Ormond is not correct.

Mr. GRAY: Then my hon. friend can get up and refute it. I consider these remarks to be an example of red tape snobbishness and brass hat unctuousness. Fortunately there were not many men of this calibre holding high commands, but I consider that as a private soldier I would be derelict to my duty if I did not stand in my place here and hurl back in his face the insult he has written into the records of this house. I say that when we have a report made not only to the minister but to the country in which words of this sort are used we can expect little from the superintendent of penitentiaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (East Hamilton): Mr. Speaker, I am one who served in the ranks during the war; I spent four years and seven months there leaving, as I entered, the equivalent to a private. I say that without shame; I am proud of it. I do not believe that even generals have a first mortgage on

all the brains and intellect in the country, and I regard this statement as an insult to the men who served during the war. After all is said and done it takes some courage to be at the front—at the front, and not at the rear. I believe this is also an insult to the intelligence of this House of Commons.

This report is a contradiction in itself, Mr. Speaker; it finds fault with the conditions under which the men were appointed, and says the rules of the Civil Service Commission were not followed. The whole report is in conflict with the spirit of this bill. Frankly I believe the government followed an absolutely wrong policy in connection with the riots at Kingston and the other penitentiaries. A royal commission should have been appointed to investigate the question, because many rumours have been broadcast throughout the country. I have one in mind; it was said that the wife of one of the brokers serving his sentence at Kingston visited one of the officials, and that during her visit her husband was sent to the house as a janitor. Statements have appeared in various newspapers throughout the country; at the moment I am only going to quote from the Conservative press. First I will refer to the Financial Post; I do not think any criticism can be made with regard to an opinion expressed by that publication. Referring to the article which appeared in the Financial Post, The Toronto Globe said:

On the other hand, the charges of the Financial Post regarding Collins Bay reflect a degree of public uneasiness that requires another sort of inquiry, one wholly removed from any aspect of parliamentary or political control. Yet the slogan, "Steal a million and see Collins Bay," recorded as having winged its way through Portsmouth, implies that much of the trouble, if not all, has been due to the incarceration of stock brokers in the "preferred class" institution.

Here is another statement from the same publication:

"On more than one occasion the Financial Post has said that back of some of the financial crooks who have been sent to various penitentiaries were bigger and more influential people whose names were never dragged through the newspaper headlines. Scapegoats, tools, chestnut-pulling monkeys served terms to pay for the illicit gains of financial ones in society." An inquiry into penitentiary administration will not be sufficient unless it brings out the complete story of the brokers.

Then we have the Toronto Telegram, which I would call friendly to the present administration. It contained this headline:

Closed Inquiry into Penal Conditions will not Satisfy Public Demand