

Citizen
Ottawa, Canada.
Thursday July 3, 1924.

EDITORIAL.

"Where the Money Goes."

The Liberal-Conservative party propaganda bureau has issued a circular under the above heading, with some interesting information about lawyers' fees. For work during the Home Bank inquiry, the government paid Eugene Lafleur, K.C., \$250 per day and expenses. A question on the order paper failed to bring out the amount paid to H. J. Symington, K.C., for services rendered in the same inquiry. But the Liberal-Conservative circular gives the information that one of Mr. Symington's partners is Mr. Hudson of Winnipeg—presumably A. B. Hudson, M.P. The public is further informed that in connection with the Great Lakes Rates inquiry the government paid the same Mr. Symington, from January 31 to April 12, 1923, \$9,450 remuneration, \$705 under the heading of "per diem allowance," and \$471.43 expenses.

This information is interesting of course, but there is nothing particularly novel about it. All parties do it, including the National Liberal and Conservative party, or whatever the full title of the Liberal-Conservative organization may be.

An even more interesting circular might be prepared on the fees that were paid last year to legal luminaries for professional services in connection with the Bank Act revision. It would be published, too, if the Liberal-Conservative organization were interested in anything else but party propaganda, to get itself back into office, so that investors in the party game on the Conservative side would enjoy more of the fat fees for themselves.

During the sessions of the banking and commerce committee, the Canadian Bankers' Association, according to published records, employed the same Mr. Symington, paying him \$20,000 plus extras of \$1,170. Amle Geoffrion, K.C., received \$20,000 also for services rendered in the same capacity. But the Bankers' Association, with that profound prescience which rises above party, at the same time retained the services of Sir Thomas White likewise for \$20,000. Another doughty Conservative, Senator Smeaton White, would appear to have been paid \$10,000 at the same time for writing that remarkable pamphlet en-

titled "Banks and Banking," which every member of parliament and every newspaperman in Canada apparently received before the parliamentary committee started work. Under the circumstances, there is very little likelihood of the Liberal-Conservative propaganda bureau sending around anything about the fees and honorariums which the defenders of established things drew on account of the Bank Act revision last session.

The present leader of the Conservative party, Mr. Meighen, had less compunction when he sat in the House as a private member during the Bank Act revision ten years ago. At that time, he boldly denounced the activities of a paid "lobbyist" for trying to influence legislation. What has the Liberal-Conservative organization, or any member of the Conservative opposition in the House, to say this session about the activities of paid lobbyists?

From the point of view of the public interest, the \$10,000 pamphlet on "Banks and Banking," served quite a useful purpose. It gave Mr. Irvine and several other inquiring members an opportunity to do some educational work. Much of the evidence of Major C. H. Douglas before the banking and commerce committee is recorded in the form of questions and answers relating to statements which appeared in the "Banks and Banking" booklet.

"The Evidence of Major C. H. Douglas" has been published in compact book form by the Credit Research Library, 70 High Holborn, London, England. It is not likely to be circulated either, by the Liberal-Conservative organization committee—particularly as the record of the evidence shows up Conservative members on the committee as political champions of negation. They might almost have been inspired by \$20,000 lawyers, let alone by the wisdom of the \$10,000 booklet.

78