

that the honourable member for De Lorimier (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) was to follow my honourable friend who has just taken his seat; but, as I may be unavoidably prevented from being here later, I desire to say just a word or two with reference to the Conservation Commission. I do not desire to deal forcibly in this House with the question of tariffs, because I do not think that it is so much a question for this House; but if I were in a condition to do so, and if I were on the stump somewhere, I would discuss that question. There is just one remark I do want to make. My honourable friend from Kamloops (Hon. Mr. Bostock) holds that because of the present trade conditions existing between Canada and the United States and the Tariff Bill which has been introduced in the United States Congress it would be highly desirable for Canada to seek all the trade with any other part of the world that would be profitable to Canada. I am somewhat of a student of conditions, and it is my observation that all the other countries in the world combined are not as important to Canada as are the United States of America. Trade exists to the extent that it does between the two countries because of natural conditions, and these conditions cannot well be overcome. However, as I have said, I do not wish to dwell upon this subject at the present moment, although I would like, and I must take some occasion, perhaps, to say something to my honourable friend regarding it. But we will discuss it together, and I shall educate him somewhat on questions of this kind. Generally I would not undertake to educate him, but on the tariff and on trade questions I may be able to do so.

Now, as to the Conservation Commission. It was appointed eleven or twelve years ago. That was an appointment very desirable for Canada. The Commission was headed by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, who, as I think this House will agree, was one of the most competent organizers, if not the most competent, that Canada has ever had. My honourable friend (Hon. Sir James Lougheed) refers to the fact that four departments of Government have to do with the same subject. But I will say this to my honourable friend, that if a commission is appointed and an unbiased investigation takes place, it will be found that the Conservation Commission has done more for the welfare of Canada than all the departments operating, and has done more than the four de-

partments to which he has referred can do in the next hundred years. And I think it would be only fair that a commission of inquiry should be appointed, and if an inquiry is made the Commission of Conservation will undoubtedly not disappear, but will be maintained. It is true that I myself, because of the resignation of Sir Clifford Sifton about three years ago, have been the acting chairman. Now, I am not speaking for myself. My desire is to relinquish that position at the earliest possible date, and the Government is aware of that fact. But in the interest of Canada I honestly say that I deplore the prospect of the wiping out of that Commission, and I do invite the Government to make a thorough inquiry before taking that action. That Commission is absolutely independent of the Government. It is only nominally under a department. I cannot here enumerate the many acts that it has done, but in the one act alone of bringing the various railways under certain provisions with regard to fire it has saved this country hundreds of millions of dollars. I think the abolition of the Commission of Conservation is a great mistake, and I regret it sincerely. I am not one of those who are desirous of criticising Governments. I do not desire to criticise the Government at all severely. They may think they are acting in the best interest of the country. But my opinion is that this is a serious blunder, and I hope that it will not be carried out.

Hon. **RAOUL DANDURAND:** Honourable gentlemen, I was interested to hear my honourable friend the leader of the Government (Hon. Sir James Lougheed) state that he and his colleagues felt that they had a full mandate to remain in power until the end of the ordinary term of Parliament, that is, five years. He bases his opinion upon the elections of 1917. I suppose that the members who formed the Cabinet in 1917 knew under what conditions they were entering that Government. I suppose that Messrs. Crerar, Carvell and Maclean knew under what conditions they were going in. They stated, not to a Cabinet council, but to the people of Canada, that they were going in simply for the time of the war and not with the idea of settling the fiscal policy of this country. I have here the report of a speech made by a fourth gentleman. The three whom I have named felt that their mandate was ended when the war was over, for Messrs. Crerar, Carvell and