

not do so well, and I think he knows what it is to be wiped off the map. He ran second to the Tories in Ontario and British Columbia, and we divided fifty-fifty with him in New Brunswick.

I do not see the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) in the House, but during the campaign in the Toronto district he evinced a keen interest in the cost of living, the question of trusts and combines, and other allied subjects. This question of combines has been made a football of by the Government of Canada and those of the provinces for many years, and I trust we shall hear the end of it and that the Government of Canada will take a leaf out of the book of the Attorney General of the United States, who prosecuted 285 combines in one year and broke them up. As a start the Government might take action against the tobacco trust. I have had several letters from soldiers and others, strongly urging that something should be done to break up this combine. The prices of a good many of the tobacco commodities of life are on the down grade and it seems an outrage that the working classes should be obliged to pay 15 cents for a plug of tobacco, while tobacco is lying in the fields not cut. Steps should be taken at once to regulate all trusts of this nature.

Before I conclude I want to protest against any action or any speech calculated to loosen the ties that bind this country to the Motherland. I think that this declaration is timely, because there is an agitation on foot in certain localities—and among certain classes that would tend to loosen that connection. I do not think that anyone did more than our King during the war to forward our interests, or was more concerned in the welfare of the Empire. Our Governor General, too, a brilliant soldier, was an inspiration to all fighting Canadians, and, I say, long may that office continue. Another office that is of use in the affairs of the country is that of Lieutenant-Governor. I do not agree with those who advocate the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council; this, I think, would be one way of loosening the ties that bind the Mother Country and Canada together. In regard to the question of Canada's representation abroad, it is my opinion that there is no necessity for an ambassador at Washington; nor do I believe that we need a High Commissioner in London. If we can do without an ambassador in Washington, why cannot we dispense, without great inconvenience, with a representative in Lon-

don? I wish it distinctly understood, of course, that I have absolutely nothing to say against the appointment that has been recently made by the Government to fill this office. The appointee is a good business man, a gentleman who is admirable in more senses than one. I sat with him on the Toronto General Hospital Board in Toronto for a number of years, and from my knowledge of and association with him I have formed a high estimate of his ability and his character. Nevertheless, I do not think that the office to which he has been appointed is very necessary. I may say, in passing, that as a friend of Mr. Larkin, I wish him good luck. I think he should answer those papers that criticise his income tax payments. In Toronto some time ago he paid taxes on an income of \$50,000. But the next year—1921—when he was assessed on a similar income, he appealed to the Court of Revision and made a declaration to the effect that his income was only \$25,000. The Court of Revision, without taking any evidence on the subject, reduced the assessment to that amount. Sir John Willison, the Canadian representative of the London Times, wrote an article which appeared in the London papers stating that Mr. Larkin's income was \$500,000, and some of the London papers are commenting on it and on his assessments. Now, while undoubtedly Mr. Larkin will make an excellent High Commissioner, I think it would have been better, both for him and the country, had he followed in the footsteps of the First Commoner, yourself, Mr. Speaker, when you announced in such modest terms that from the moment of your election to your high office you ceased to be a party man. It would be better for all concerned if Mr. Larkin refrained from attending party dinners. I say it would be in his own interests, and I am speaking as a friend of his; for, I repeat, I found him an honourable business man, having sat with him on the Board in the building of the Toronto General Hospital, a \$5,000,000 hospital. I can say that he has done a wonderful service as a citizen. As his friend, I say that he should make it clear just what his income is on which he has to pay local and federal taxes and answer his critics. I have every confidence in his integrity.

In conclusion, I desire to thank you, Sir, and the members of this House, for the way they have listened to me, and on my own behalf I thank you for your patience.