

will find that the expenditures for the Labour Department for 1910-11 were \$93,000, not \$63,000 as he gave.

Mr. TURRIFF: We can settle that matter again. But I will venture the assertion that generally speaking those figures are right, and I may state that I risk my seat in the House on the correctness, generally speaking, of these figures. It is quite possible I may have made a mistake in one of them. The hon. member for St. Antoine division spoke about the new rate of taxation introduced by the minister this afternoon, and he showed how much more taxes a firm would have to pay that was capitalized at \$100,000 under the new rate of taxation than under the old rate. But my hon. friend knows perfectly well that in his own city, not long ago, it was published in the papers by one of the munition firms there that they had made 1,500 per cent, and it was stated in the newspapers that they had paid 900 per cent. And how were they enabled to do that? They were enabled to do that owing to the prices fixed by this Government, through their Imperial Munitions Board—first through the old Shell Committee and subsequently through the Imperial Board. This Government, through their Imperial Munitions Board which they appointed, fixed the prices for these concerns who have been enabled to make not 25 per cent, as my hon. friend stated, but hundreds per cent, and I ask you is it right that the people of Canada should be compelled to pay for the munitions that their soldiers are using at prices so extravagant as those prices to enable companies to make many hundreds per cent? We know of a case in Hamilton where a man made all the money he wanted in the first year and then offered his plant to the Government to let them make munitions at cost and the Government refused it. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour stated that the Government was not going into competition with private enterprise. There was an opportunity for the Government to have found out how much it cost to make shells and shell cases and other munitions. They would not accept the offer, and the next year this man turned over his profits to the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, you are guessing.

Mr. TURRIFF: It was so stated in the papers and never contradicted.

Mr. CROTHERS: I never made that statement in my life.

[Mr. Crothers.]

Mr. TURRIFF: Did not Mr. Baily of Hamilton hand anything over to the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe he did to the Munitions Board.

Mr. TURRIFF: He offered this Government to hand over his factory to your Board, and the second year he handed over the profits, \$775,000, and it was divided up, as was stated, between the British Patriotic Fund and some of the Canadian patriotic funds.

Sir HERBERT AMES: We did not get any of it.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Government fixes the price and enables their friends the manufacturers to charge almost any profit they like. And then we have my hon. friend from Montreal coming forward and stating that this is an economical Government.

I rose for the purpose of moving an amendment and on that amendment I wish to say a few words. The amendment I propose to move at the conclusion of my remarks is as follows:

That all the words after the word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

This House desires to take the earliest opportunity of expressing its pleasure that the Government has at last yielded to the persistent demands of the Grain Growers of the West as frequently set forth by delegations and resolutions of the representatives of the farming interest, and repeatedly voiced by the Liberal party in this House, by placing wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby securing a free market for wheat and wheat products in the United States.

This House is of the opinion that if the policy of Free Wheat is made permanent it will enormously increase the prosperity of the West and be to the general advantage of the whole Dominion.

In order that the country may be assured of such permanency and that the action of the Administration is not a mere temporary expedient which may be revoked at any time by the Government without reference to Parliament, this House would urge upon the Government the desirability of submitting early in the present session a measure to place by statute wheat, wheat flour and semolina on the free list, and thereby encourage the farmers to engage in the largest wheat production possible.

We have heard a good deal in this House during the past few years about free wheat, and the Government have at last been forced to listen to their friends in the West and in the East and to put wheat, wheat flour and wheat products on the free list. What has induced the Government to do