

clause of the treaty, which has been the occasion of a good deal of justifiable criticism, is likely to be altered owing to the able and resolute attitude taken by the honourable gentlemen who went from Canada.

The next paragraph deals with the tariff and says in part:

It is the opinion of my advisors that in such revision regard must be had to the necessities of revenue and as well that the principle of protection to Canadian labour and legitimate Canadian industries, including agriculture, which has prevailed for more than forty years in this country, must be consistently maintained; but that the customs duties imposed to that end, should be no higher than is essential to ensure good standards of living among our working population and to retain and make possible the normal expansion of the industries in which they find employment.

No one can gather from that paragraph just what is in the mind of the Government. That is all right: we shall ascertain what they mean when the Minister of Finance makes his statement. But there is this thing to be borne in mind: that while it is desirable that the necessaries of life should not be unduly enhanced in price—and I think it is admitted in this paragraph—on the other hand there is a question as to where a line should be drawn. It was shown here last Session and the Session before, I think, that in certain industries tremendous profits were made: in the textile industry, for instance, the shareholders of a concern called the Dominion Textile Company divided 300 per cent. Surely the Government do not propose to add to the duty on textiles. The people who manufacture these textiles are now making very handsome profits, and I do not think they are objects of any special consideration.

Then we are told:

Bills relating to copyrights, the simplification and consolidation of the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and amending Acts, scientific research, and other matters will be submitted to you.

Honourable gentlemen will remember that some two or three years ago there was submitted to this House a very carefully drawn and elaborate Bill with respect to copyright. That Bill was allowed to die in committee; for some reason or other the Government decided not to proceed. There is no doubt that some measure of the kind was needed, but the Government did not proceed. Let us hope that now, having got a sort of second wind, they may go on and deal with the matter, and deal with it satisfactorily.

We were told last year, unless I am very much mistaken, that the Income War Tax Act was to be consolidated and distributed in the shape of a pamphlet. That pamphlet, as far as I am aware, has not reached the taxpayers yet, and I trust that this time we shall have better luck.

The paragraph of the Speech addressed to the members of the House of Commons, with which, I suppose, we have nothing to do, states that the Estimates have been formed with a view to strict economy. Coming from this Government, in the light of their record even for the past year, their talking of doing things with strict economy does seem rather a joke. This reminds me that the day before yesterday the honourable leader of the Government was very facetious. He laughed and almost sang, he felt so cheerful over the probable result of the coming elections—that is, when they do come; but he reminded me rather of the man who whistled to keep his courage up, because I do not think that any intelligent supporter of the Government who looks abroad over this country to-day can say that the Government and their supporters have any particular reason to be very chirpy just now. The prospects, I think, are not very favourable from their point of view.

Now, honourable gentlemen, I am thankful to you for having listened to me so patiently, and I retire.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Crosby, the debate was adjourned.

## REVISION OF PUNISHMENTS BILL.

### SECOND READING

Hon. Mr. McMEANS moved the second reading of Bill B, an Act to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments. He said: Honourable gentlemen, I think it is entirely unnecessary for me to advance any argument as to why this Bill should pass this House for a third time. It has already passed this honourable body on two former occasions, and has been sent to the House of Commons, but, owing to the lateness of the Session when it reached the House of Commons, it did not get a hearing. It is simply an Act to provide that, in the event of an error being made by a judge in delivering sentence, by leave of the Court of Appeal the sentence may be either increased or decreased. I could cite numerous cases in which the trial judge has erred, and in which he would have been very glad of a provision of this kind. I believe this is the only British country