

There is another factor which is exercising the minds of many of the people of this country in regard to imports from the United States; they seem to think that because we are importing so much goods from the United States we are getting the worst of the deal. As a matter of fact, if we are buying goods from the United States we are doing so because we can buy them there to the best advantage; we are the ones who are spending the money. That is not the only point we should keep before us, however; there is another point which is very important. There is no doubt that at present large sums of money, or rather large amounts of wealth, are coming from the United States for investment in this country, and the only way these investments can be made in Canada by the United States people is through the exportation of goods in order to take care of their credits. That is the only way wealth can come into this country, in the final analysis, for the purpose of being invested here. If we want to turn down these investments, all well and good; personally I am not in favour of it. If people outside of Canada feel that they can invest in this country and so develop our natural resources that is all right as far as I am concerned, but it should be clearly understood that when these credits come in for investment purposes they must be followed by goods in order to take care of the credits.

I believe my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Adshead) at the last session of parliament made a plea for more adequate returns with regard to our financial relations with other countries. We have many invisible imports to-day and many invisible exports which are not indicated under our present system of accounting, and I would suggest to my good friend the Minister of Finance that this is an opportunity for him to display his great energy in getting more accurate information in respect to these invisible items, so that the members of parliament and the people of Canada as a whole will have an opportunity of sizing up the situation as it actually is rather than having to guess at it, as we must do at present.

The Prime Minister has referred to the matter of the return of the natural resources to the prairie provinces, and that question is also touched upon in the speech from the throne. As legislation will be introduced during the session in this regard I do not purpose discussing this matter to any extent at present; anything I have to say with regard to this question will be said when the legislation is before the house. I have had the privilege of

[Mr. Gardiner.]

going through the agreement which has been signed by the province of Alberta and the federal government, and there are some points in connection with that agreement in regard to which I desire to secure an explanation. Therefore I do not propose to discuss the matter further than to say that I congratulate the government on being able at least to satisfy these two provincial governments with regard to the question of natural resources. I do not wish to place myself to-night in the position of agreeing absolutely with the terms of the agreement, but I will have something further to say about this subject when the legislation is before the house.

I am rather pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the speech from the throne mentioned the question of pensions to the returned men. First let me say that the mover of the address this afternoon stated, or at least inferred, that this question of dealing with the problems of the returned soldiers had been more or less a partisan question in this house, and that primarily the Liberal party had been responsible for all that had been done for these men. In that I think my hon. friend made a mistake, which is more or less excusable because he is a new member. So far as I am concerned I want to pay tribute to all parties in this house to the extent that this matter has never been a party question; indeed all parties have combined and given the best that they had to try to solve these very intricate problems, and I hope and trust that when this matter again comes before the committee the same spirit will prevail.

Some little time ago I received a letter from one of the returned men, and I am going to read an extract from it to give the house some idea of a few of the matters which are irritating the returned men and more particularly those men who suffered such disabilities as amputations and so on. This gentleman writes me quite a long letter, and with the permission of the house I would like to read just one paragraph from it in order to show how these men feel. He writes in part as follows:

It appears when a pension is allowed for disability, fractions of limbs are taken into consideration in my own case you see (by letter enclosed) that I lose 10 per cent disability because I have fractions of finger and thumb left, in circumstances that mean so fine an adjustment particularly on the hands. Would it not be more fair to allow the man the benefit of pensionable disability to the next joint as the stumps in my own case are useless?

I also have before me a letter which this man received when he got his pension in the first place. It is dated Ottawa, September 20.