

Summing up, they say:

Your committee therefore recommend that in view of the existing tariff on sugar and in consideration of the substantial payments being made to agriculture and labour by the beet sugar factories at present in operation, the cane sugar refineries should undertake to provide for a gradual increase in factory facilities for the refining of beet sugar in Canada, and that, with the additional advantages in freight rates to points in the middle west, heretofore described, factory facilities should now be steadily increased in western areas where beets are grown, thereby making it possible to produce from beets a more substantial percentage of the sugar consumption of Canada.

Your committee further recommends that if no successful attempt be made in the immediate future by the refineries to increase the facilities for the manufacture of beet sugar, the government should take into consideration steps to accomplish that end.

That was the report, Mr. Speaker, about two years ago. Since then, of course, times have been unusual, but so far as we have been able to understand, nothing has yet been done to carry out that recommendation, which passed this house unanimously. I think that the government should give this matter their immediate attention, in the hope and expectation of doing something to ameliorate the desperate conditions that exist in that part of the country. Money spent by the beet sugar factory is spread over a wide area and goes into many hands. The factory at Raymond spends something like \$630,000 a year in the purchase of beets and another \$665,000 for supplies, freight and labour. The chief item of cost is fuel, and if the factory could be established in Medicine Hat where natural gas is available that item of cost would be much less. I wanted to bring these facts to the attention of the government and the house because I believe that something can be done which will bring joy and satisfaction to a great many people on these irrigated farms. True, someone has said that there is a great overproduction of sugar throughout the world, but that obtains in respect to other articles as well. There seems to be over-production of wheat, yet we find the nations of Europe using their lands to produce wheat when they might use them for other purposes. We cannot do that to any great extent, but I do feel that if some encouragement were given to the industry, some tariff adjustments made to force the refineries to expand their plants according to the spirit of this report, much good would be accomplished.

We have taken this matter up with some of the refiners, with Mr. Rogers in particular. He points out that he has no intention of expanding refining capacity at the present

time, and although the report was published in this form, no arrangement has been made to decide which refineries shall take charge of certain areas. I wish to close by expressing the hope that the government will find time to review this whole problem, and will be able to give some hope of relief to the people concerned.

On motion of Mr. Stewart (Edmonton) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Bennett the house adjourned at 10.58 p.m.

### Wednesday, January 31, 1934

The house met at three o'clock.

#### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. A. U. G. BURY (East Edmonton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5, to amend the criminal code.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BURY: The purpose of the bill is to make two amendments in section 750 of the criminal code, in Part XV, in connection with summary convictions.

The first amendment is to extend to those who have been convicted and sentenced to a fine without imprisonment on default the same rights as are now under the code extended to those who have been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment without a fine, and to those who have been convicted and sentenced to a fine and, in default of payment, imprisonment, both of which classes on appeal can enter into a recognizance and remain at liberty until their appeal comes on. In the case of a man convicted and sentenced to a fine without imprisonment on default there is no such provision, and he must pay his fine and costs in full before he can appeal. The purpose of the amendment is to extend to him the same privilege as is granted already to the two classes first mentioned.

The other amendment is intended to preserve to a convicted person the right of appeal notwithstanding his having failed to indicate an intention of appealing after his conviction. As the law now stands if a man convicted and sentenced pays his fine, and then later within the time limit specified by the code, files his notice of appeal, he may be and sometimes is met at the court of appeal with the objection that he has waived his right of appeal by paying his fine without then indi-