

are going to lose the money and the settlers as well if we do not do that. Better keep the soldier settlers, and give them an extension. It is coming to them, and it is not their fault that they have not succeeded. We induced them to go on the land under big prices created by the war. They did enough for us during the war and let us shoulder the responsibility. I read an item in my platform last night asking for more considered treatment for the wounded soldier. That question crops up in the West. There are a lot of wounded men in the West, and we think they were not well treated. Their pensions were cut down to a minimum, and they have been at considerable expense. It has been suggested that these men are malingerers. These men who have served at the front and been wounded cannot be accused of malingering, and they ought to receive consideration.

The answer of the Government is that it means increased expenditure. Well there are ways of effecting economy without making the destitute soldiers suffer. I suggest that we cut off some of the ceremonial connected with this House. This is a democratic nation, and we might well forego, for a time at least, all these ceremonies. We have a beautiful restaurant upstairs, and it is a pleasure to take our friends up there, but it is run at a tremendous loss. I am willing, and I think other members are, to pay for our meals in future and save that expense. There are many ways in which economy could be effected without loss of efficiency.

Referring to the inheritance tax. Is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) aware that in New Zealand and in Great Britain they have an inheritance tax, or death duties which we do not have in Canada at all? We have a provincial inheritance tax, but no Dominion tax, and if we had such a duty in Canada as they have in New Zealand and Britain, the revenue would receive something like \$30,000,000 a year, and it would come out of the pockets of the people best able to afford it, people who have built up large fortunes during the war and could well afford to contribute to the state after they have gone;—it might be better for them in the place where they have gone if they gave the country back some of their wealth.

I would also suggest that they might remove the Northwest Mounted Police from British Columbia. They were put there in a crisis in special emergency. They are no longer needed. We have an efficient

[Mr. Neill.]

provincial police force, and by removing this force we would save expense.

I mentioned last night that the eight-hour law was a part of the platform on which I was elected. I see no mention of it in the Speech from the Throne. The Trades and Labour council took it up with the Government, and I hope to see the Government, in the course of the session at least, make some pronouncement as to their attitude in the matter. If they are not prepared to assume the responsibility for enacting it, then they ought to call the provinces together, if it is decided that it is a provincial matter. It is a duty we owe, under the Treaty of Versailles, to carry this out as speedily as we can, in accordance with our pledges in that treaty. The same might be said of the old-age pension. In November, 1921, the British Columbia House passed a resolution un-animously calling attention to the fact that this government had assumed responsibility for the old-age pension and suggesting that it was time for them to take action. I do not expect the Government to take action on that matter this session, but I commend it for their consideration in a future session.

I wish to call attention to a further point and I am surprised that no other hon. member has taken it up. I am heartily in accord with the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) when he expressed the opinion that the Dominion Elections' Act should be removed from the statutes. I go further and state it should be removed as speedily as possible, that we may remove the stigma from our public life, that we have had an act on the statute which lends itself to almost every form of corruption. If we must retain the act let us change the name of it. It is now known as the Dominion Elections' Act, let it be known as the Dominion Elections' Corruption Possibilities Act. It may be said that I am using too strong words when I say that it encourages every form of political corruption. I think the statement is well-advised, because those of us who are lawyers know that if a man carelessly leaves his money lying around his premises he is as much to blame as the poor boy or girl who picks it up. You have often heard the judge in court say "You are encouraging theft by leaving your money around," and an act which is passed for the avowed purpose of preserving purity of elections should not permit or allow the gross abuses which are possible under that act. I speak from somewhat bitter experience in my own case. I have the data all here, but